

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLVI

APRIL, 1948

NO. 1024

"The Day Which the Lord Hath Made"

J. I. BERGIN, S.J.

*Reprinted from the CANADIAN MESSENGER OF THE SACRED HEART**

ON Easter Day Holy Mother Church rejoices with a great joy. As we enter a Catholic Church on Easter morning, a glance suffices to tell us that some extraordinary change has taken place; that close upon those days of sorrow and humiliation, when our hearts and our affections dwelt with our afflicted Saviour in the desolation of Gethsemane, in the injustice and the cruelty of Jerusalem, and in the darkness and the ignominy of Calvary, there has sounded throughout the Church of Christ the glad announcement of a glorious triumph: "This is the day which the Lord hath made: let us be glad and rejoice therein" (*Ps.* 117, 27). No longer do we assemble in a house of bitter mourning, bare of

ornament and breathing of sadness: a feeling of exultation surges upon us from every side. Our altars are resplendent with symbols of festivity; the prayers and the music of the sacred liturgy ring forth a note of gladness; the garments of grief have been laid aside for the robes of rejoicing, while the oft-repeated "Alleluia" proclaims to the world that the sorrow of Christ's Spouse in union with His cruel Passion and shameful death has been turned into joy by the final victory of His glorious Resurrection.

We have grieved with Holy Mother Church in her hour of sorrow and desolation; as we enter now fully into her rejoicing, we should examine the motives which prompt

this joy and place the day of Christ's Resurrection as the greatest feast in the Christian calendar.

FEAST OF THE REDEMPTION

Considered in relation to His sacred Passion and Death, the Resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ signalizes His victory over the powers of darkness, His entrance into the glory which He had earned for Himself by His Sacrifice on the Cross, and the triumphant consummation of the work of man's redemption. The Catholic Church looks upon the Resurrection as an integral, though not an essential, element of the atonement; for, strictly speaking, the sole cause of our redemption was the Saviour's death on Calvary. Since, however, the Resurrection was necessary to complete the mystery of our salvation and redemption, the Church mourns on Good Friday with Christ in His suffering, and celebrates Easter as the great feast of the redemption; for by His death Christ liberated us from our sins, and by His Resurrection He restored to us the principle blessings which we had forfeited by sin. Hence it is said by the Apostle: "He was delivered up for our sins, and rose again for our justification" (*Rom. 4, 25*).

That nothing, therefore, might be wanting to the salvation of the human race, it was meet that, as Christ should die, He should also rise again. This teaching is in perfect accord

with the Holy Gospel, which links the crucifixion of Our Lord with His Resurrection, and represents both events as one indivisible whole: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooves Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead the third day: and that penance and remission of sins should be preached in His name unto all nations" (*Luke 24, 46-47*).

St. Paul deepened this conception by pointing out that the crucifixion and the redemption contain the two essential elements of justification—remission of sin and infusion of a new life. As Christ died and rose again from the dead, so shall we die to sin and rise to spiritual life: "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin may be destroyed, to the end that we may serve sin no longer. For he that is dead is justified from sin. Now, if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall live also together with Christ: knowing that Christ rising again from the dead dieth now no more; death shall have no more dominion over Him" (*Rom. 6, 6-9*).

If we look for a further motive of rejoicing in the Resurrection, we may regard it in its relation as an historical fact to the Church which Christ came to establish upon earth. This aspect of the great mystery is an important and especially practical consideration in an age when even so-called Christian sects have abandoned their belief

in the divinity of Christ, and, while proclaiming Him the perfect Man, refuse to acknowledge His divine nature and personality united to a body and soul like ours, His eternal existence as the Second Person of the Most Holy Trinity, His perfect equality in all things with the Father.

Among all the miracles of Christ's life on earth His glorious Resurrection from the dead, as an historical fact proved beyond the shadow of doubt, is the crowning proof of His divinity, the solid foundation and chief bulwark of our faith, the pledge of our own future resurrection. For, "if Christ be not risen again," writes St. Paul to the Corinthians, "then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain; if the dead rise not again, neither is Christ risen again" (1 Cor. 15, 14, 17).

In fact, Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself foretold and pointed out His Resurrection above all His other miracles as the incontrovertible sign and the irrefragable proof of His divinity and of His divine mission. For, when the Scribes and Pharisees said to Him: "Master we would see a sign from Thee," Jesus answered them: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign, and a sign shall not be given it, but the sign of Jonas the prophet." That is to say, they shall not dictate the sign or the miracle by which I am to prove my Godhead; but this sign do I point out to them above all other signs—the sign pre-

figured in the person of Jonas. "For," Our Saviour goes on to say, "as Jonas was in the whale's belly three days and three nights: so shall the Son of Man be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights" (Matt. 12, 39-40).

So, too, it is upon this great truth that the Apostles base all their teaching. Matthias is elected to fill the place vacated by the traitor Judas, that he may be with the other Apostles a witness of Christ's Resurrection. St. Peter makes it the subject of his first sermon to the Jewish people. St. Paul, with his characteristic zeal, proclaims to the Athenians Jesus and the Resurrection in the name of the risen Christ. The Apostles work miracles to confirm their teaching. Through nineteen centuries the faith of Christianity has stood unshaken upon the fact of Christ's Resurrection.

If Christ is truly risen, then our faith is firm—as even the rationalists themselves admit—for since His Resurrection was repeatedly foretold by Christ, we have in the fact of the same Resurrection the fulfillment of a prophecy certainly divine—a miracle in the intellectual order; and, since all admit that such an event transcends beyond a doubt all the forces of nature known or unknown, we have in Christ's Resurrection a miracle in the physical order. Moreover, the fact was predicted and chosen in a special manner by Christ, as we have pointed out, to be the sign and the seal of His

divine mission and of His divine personality. Nor can anyone for a moment suppose that, if Christ were not really the Messiah, God would, by such special and supernatural intervention as we behold in the Resurrection, stamp with His approval an impostor who even to the end proclaimed himself the Son of God.

OUR OWN RESURRECTION A DIVINE PROMISE

Hence, if the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is an historical fact, Jesus Christ is truly the Son of God, His mission on earth is a divine mission, the Church which He founded upon the Apostles and their successors, with whom He promised to be all days even to the consummation of the world, is the only true Church of God; our own resurrection from the dead, promised and foretold by Christ, is no mere empty hope, but a divine promise which cannot fail of fulfillment.

Is then the Resurrection of Christ a real historical fact? If we take the New Testament and consider it as a mere historical document—leaving aside the solemn declaration of Holy Mother Church that it contains the inspired word of God Himself—we have a collection of writings, the historical authenticity and the veracity of which are more clearly, more fully, more certainly established than those of all the ancient documents which are never called into question. If we

consult these historical records, which have withstood triumphantly the hostile attacks of critics for nineteen centuries, we find recorded and proved with such startling clearness and such singular wealth of detail the death of Our Lord Jesus Christ upon the Cross and His subsequent Resurrection, that there can not be the slightest doubt of the fact even on purely historical grounds.

Jesus Christ truly died. The reality of His death was never doubted, never denied, either at the time by the chief priests of the Jews or afterward by the most implacable enemies of Christianity. It was only at the beginning of the last century that Salvador, a Jewish writer, and Paulus, a German rationalist, with some few others, were bold enough to assert that Christ did not die upon the Cross, but, having fallen into a swoon, afterward came to Himself and showed Himself to the disciples: that He died finally in some unknown place. This theory, in the face of the clear historic testimony of the New Testament, finds but few, if any, scholarly supporters today; for, besides being historically false, it involves both a physical and a moral impossibility.

First, it is historically false. For the centurion and all the Roman soldiers who were present at the crucifixion, the beloved disciple, John, and the pious women who stood at the foot of the Cross, were eye-witnesses to the fact, unanimously recorded by the

Evangelists, that Jesus, "having cried out with a loud voice, gave up the ghost."

Nor would Pilate give leave for the burial of His body until he had sent for the centurion and learned officially from him that Jesus was already dead. When the Jews asked that the bodies of the crucified be removed before the Sabbath, soldiers were sent to break their legs, in order that no trace of doubt about their death should remain. But, when they came to Jesus, finding "that he was already dead, they did not break His legs, but one of the soldiers with a spear opened His side, and immediately there came out blood and water," (*John* 19). Then only was the body of Our Saviour handed over to Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, who, St. John tells us, "brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes about a hundred pounds weight, and bound the body of the Christ in linen cloths with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury": a process, surely, which alone would preclude any possibility of survival.

Finally, the Jews, who had taken such watchful pains to have the death sentence of Our Lord put into execution, can be trusted to have seen to it that He was not left half-dead. The French writer, Renan, whose attacks on Christ and Christianity render his testimony on this point all the more telling, affirms that the most solid proof of Christ's death lies in the hatred of the Jews; for, he says, since

they clamored so violently for His death, they certainly left nothing undone to make sure that He really died.

In the light, therefore, of the unanimous testimony of so many eye-witnesses, both friends and enemies of Jesus, whose interest it was to examine closely into the truth of the matter, how ridiculous are the feeble speculations of those rationalists who are pleased to call into question a fact that has been universally admitted, even by those hostile to the name of Christ, for over nineteen hundred years.

Secondly, it is physically impossible that Jesus did not really die. For after He had been cruelly scourged, crowned with thorns and subjected to such barbarous ill-treatment as only deadly hatred could devise, He was so bereft of strength as to have been unable alone to carry His Cross to the top of Calvary. Then came the sufferings of the crucifixion, the tearing of the garments from His bleeding flesh, the huge spikes driven through His sacred hands and feet, the three hours during which He hung in unspeakable agony, until all present saw Him expire and witnessed such signs and prodigies in that moment as made the centurion exclaim: "This was truly the Son of God." Even if we suppose that some spark of life still lingered in that mangled frame, there was not the slightest possibility of its surviving the thrust of the lance which brought forth the evidence of death, or the embalming and winding per-

formed by Joseph and Nicodemus, or the burial in a closed sepulcher.

Thirdly, to deny the fact of Christ's death involves a moral impossibility. For Jesus afterward, as we shall see, showed Himself to many as truly risen from the dead. Therefore, if His death was not real, either He was an impostor and a deceiver, or His apostles were deceivers and impostors. But who will explain how these same men, who before the supposed Resurrection of Christ were so slow to believe, so cowardly, so fainthearted, became of a sudden after the Resurrection the strong and fearless champions of the risen Messiah; proclaimed the name and the doctrine of Jesus Christ with intrepid zeal before Jews and Gentiles and in the face of the very tribunals of the chief priests; feared neither stripes nor prisons nor even death itself, but rejoiced, as we read in the *Acts* (5, 41), that they were accounted worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Jesus?

How can we account for such a marvelous change, if we are to say that the disciples saw their Master, after He came out of a swoon, broken down in mind and in body by torture, still covered with horrible wounds, by degrees and with difficulty regaining a little strength, only to steal away to some obscure hiding-place, there to await death in the ignoble defeat of all His claims as the Messiah, the Son of God made Man? Even the rationalists themselves are forced to admit

the impossibility of this. "It is impossible," says Strauss, "that a man coming forth half-dead from a sepulcher, weak and tottering in health, in need of a physician, of bandages, of medicines, of nursing, and collapsing with pain, could have persuaded the minds of his disciples that he was the conqueror of death and the tomb, and the author of life—a persuasion which, nevertheless, seems to have struck deep root in the Apostles. Such a resurrection as this would have weakened in them, or at least, saddened, the persuasion they had conceived from his life and death; but it would not in the least have changed their sadness into enthusiasm and their reverence into religion" (*Das Leben Jesu für das Deutsche Volk*).

UNDENIABLE FACT

Jesus Christ, then, truly died: just as truly did He rise from the dead. If anyone without prejudice will examine the principal circumstances of the Resurrection as narrated by the Evangelists, it will be immediately manifest to him that the fact of the Resurrection cannot be denied without at the same time casting aside the force and the value of human testimony. Taking the *New Testament* again as a merely human and historical document, we find in the first place that Jesus, after His death, appeared in the flesh not once or twice, not to one or another only of His disciples, not in one place alone, but

many times, to many persons, and in many places. He showed Himself to Mary Magdalen as she wept by the empty sepulcher; to the pious women as they were returning from it; to Simon Peter; to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus; to all the Apostles assembled in the supper-room—once when Thomas was absent, again when Thomas was present and was ordered by the risen Master to put his finger in the place of the nails, and his hand in the wound made by the soldier's lance. He showed Himself to five Apostles and two disciples at the sea of Tiberias; to the eleven Apostles who had gone into Galilee unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them; to more than five hundred of the brethren gathered together; to James, as we learn from St. Paul (I *Cor.* 15, 7); finally to the eleven Apostles in Jerusalem, when He bade them not to depart from the city until they should receive the Holy Spirit.

Afterward Christ led these same Apostles into Bethania and, while they looked on, ascended into heaven. Later still, He appeared to Paul on the road to Damascus and in a moment converted him from his bitter persecution and made him the ardent Apostle of the Gentiles. Nor did Christ manifest Himself after death only in passing and in momentary visions: He conversed with His Apostles, ate with them and instructed them at length: "To whom also," we read in

the *Acts* (1, 3), "He showed Himself alive after His passion, by many proofs for forty days appearing to them, and speaking of the kingdom of God." The Apostles, therefore, were able to see Him, to converse with Him: we cannot say that they were victims of deception.

Moreover, the witnesses of Christ's Resurrection were strikingly endowed with all these qualities which go to make their testimony certain and trustworthy. They were simple, honest, God-fearing men, not rashly to be suspected of fraud or of hallucination. Nor can they be accused of being overcredulous; for, when the holy women announced to them that the Master had risen and had appeared to them, they treated their words as idle tales. Even when Christ Himself stood before them in all the splendor of His risen glory, they did not at first believe, but were terrified, thought they saw a spirit, and would not trust their eyes until He had made them touch and feel His body, and had eaten before them. Thomas, who was absent at the time of the first visit of Our Lord, showed himself even more incredulous when told of it by the other Apostles: "Except I shall see in His hands," he said, "the print of the nails, and put my finger in the place of the nails, and put my hand into His side, I will not believe" Clearly, the Apostles were not overcredulous.

Finally the testimony of the Gos-

pel witnesses is confirmed by the circumstances of Christ's Resurrection. Certain it is that the body of Jesus was buried after it had been taken down from the Cross; it is no less certain that on the third day the sepulcher was found empty. This both the Jews themselves and the rationalists are forced to admit. What then became of Christ's body? Was it swallowed by the rock split open by the earthquake? But, apart from the fact that this is a wholly unwarranted supposition, why was there no evidence of such an opening in the sepulcher? Why did not the linen cloths in which the body had been tightly wrapped, and the napkin that was about the head, disappear with the body?

But perhaps the body was carried off secretly by the disciples? A likely proceeding, indeed, when the disciples, bereft of all courage, were cowering in the supper-room behind closed doors for fear of the Jews. Even though they had had the boldness to attempt such a deed, was not the tomb well guarded? Do we not read in *St. Matthew* (27), that "the Pharisees came together to Pilate, saying: Sir, we remember that that seducer said, while he was yet alive: After three days I will rise again. Command therefore the sepulcher to be guarded until the third day: lest perhaps his disciples come and steal him away, and say to the people: He is risen from the dead; and the last error shall be

worse than the first. Pilate saith to them: You have a guard; go guard it as you know. And they departing, made the sepulcher sure, sealing the stone, and setting the guards."

BRIBED BY CHIEF PRIESTS

When some of the guards came into the city after the Resurrection "and told the chief priests all that had been done," we read that the chief priests "being assembled together with the ancients, taking counsel, gave a great sum of money to the soldiers, saying: Say you, His disciples came at night and stole Him away when we were asleep. And, if the governor shall hear of this, we will persuade him, and secure you. So they, taking the money, did as they were taught: and this was spread abroad among the Jews even to this day" (*Matt.* 27). "Truly," says St. Augustine, commenting on this passage, "thou wert verily asleep who didst invent such an absurdity. For, if the guards were asleep, what were they able to see? And, if they saw nothing, how can they be witnesses?" Surely, if any such deed had been perpetrated, both the soldiers who guarded the sepulcher, and the disciples who carried off the body, would have been dragged before the courts and punished severely according to law. But, instead, we find the guards bribed by the chief priests. As to the Apostles, although they publicly and persistently preached the Resurrection of the

Lord even in the face of the Sanhedrim, they were never accused or condemned as violators of the tomb.

Thus, when we examine on purely historical grounds the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, we find no fact in history more solidly established. Is it surprising then, considering the consequences that force themselves upon the recognition of this truth, that today throughout the whole world the Catholic Church should rejoice with a joy exceedingly great? Jesus Christ is truly risen: the enemies of His person and of His religion have been put to confusion, His sufferings and ignominies have become the matter of His triumph, the very instrument of His death has become the adorable standard of His victory over the powers of darkness; His humble followers, assured ever since that bright and peaceful morning of a Saviour, a Mediator, an all-powerful Champion, find in the miracle of His Resurrection the keystone of their faith, the foundation of their hope, the pledge of their own glorious resurrection.

Our Easter prayer should be one of thanksgiving for our spiritual inheritance, of petition for grace to rise to the fullness of the new life which Christ brought upon earth, to grow stronger day by day in the faith that is ours.

We know not what lot awaits the Church, save only that she will be found ever faithful in her divine mission to console, to teach, to protect, to save man unto eternal life, whether outwardly triumphant or in the midst of trials and persecutions, teaching and defending always the doctrine of her Divine Founder and dispensing the graces of His life-giving sacraments. This is her true life—the glory which is hers and her children's and which cannot be taken from her. Pre-figured in the old covenant, instituted by Christ in the fulness of time, fertilized by the blood of countless martyrs, ever combating error and never for a moment wavering in her faith; at times betrayed, even as her Master, by her own sons, yet ever consoled by the acquisition of new children; persecuted, but never cast down; assailed by every power of earth and of hell, yet ever mysteriously triumphing; towering high above all political revolutions; continually rising with renewed vigor whenever her foes are preparing to sing the song of their imagined victory; ever and in all things the Catholic Church has realized the promise of her Divine Founder Jesus Christ, the Risen Saviour, that He will be with her all days even to the consummation of the world; that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her.

The Apostolate of Marriage

CONLETH OVERMAN, C.P.

*Reprinted from ORATE FRATRES**

CHRISTIAN married life, like the man who was travelling from Jerusalem to Jericho, has fallen among bandits. The State of Matrimony has been robbed and wounded and lies half-dead in our country along the high road of life. A good Samaritan has stopped, however. Our benign and blessed Lady in the vigorous new Cana Conference Movement is having pity on married people everywhere and is bringing them back to the satisfying concept of true union in Christ. The following "blueprint for the apostolate of marriage" was originally worked out for one small group of Cana people. It may be of worth to others.

In all our thinking about how to bind up the wounds of modern family life, we must never forget that the devil is the Great Separator. His strategy is "divide and conquer!" This evil spirit started his career of hatred and destruction by separating man from God in the garden of Eden. Since that time the disastrous trail of division marks his influence in the affairs of men.

See how the Great Separator works: he separated man from God by sin; now he separates nation from

nation; he separates class from class within nations—the working man from management, the rich from the poor, the farmer from the industrialist, white from colored; he separates Church from state to their mutual undoing. And now in our land the Great Separator is dividing man from man so that one person no longer knows the neighbor on his own street; he is separating husband from wife in divorce, and parents from children in the breakdown of the home.

The objective of every Christian is therefore to undo the work of the Great Separator. Unite! Bind together! Pierce through the causes for division and join hands! The Christian is known for his efforts to build up the community, as Christ said: "He that is not with me is against me: and he that gathereth not with me scattereth" (*Matt. 13, 30*). And again: "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another" (*John 13, 35*).

Extreme individualism (which is diabolic) spells the triumph of the Great Separator. If that trend continues we are lost. Divide and conquer, says the enemy of mankind. Unless we intelligently consider ways

* Collegeville, Minn., November 2, 1947

of renewing the bonds of society on all its levels we are in for much misery.

WHAT TO DO?

In general, wherever we see division we must unite. Since we are here primarily concerned with family life, we shall limit our suggestions to this topic.

The agents to achieve unity. First and foremost, husband and wife must be one in the Sacrament of Matrimony. By the teaching of Christ, they are one flesh, and are called to a unity of mind and purpose as Christ is one with His Church.

Secondly, parents and children must be knit in the closest possible community life within the home. Here, of course, the parents must take the lead. They must fight with doggedness and determination every influence, every organization, that seeks to split the children away from the home. Even many otherwise good movements are doing the work of the Great Separator by taking children from the parents too early or for too great a time. But the children, too, must be made to see that they have a responsibility in contributing to the community life within the home. The formation of the children and their happiness depend on their cooperation in home activities.

Thirdly, families must unite within the neighborhood to create a community which will be a healthful en-

vironment for their children. The devil wants each family to live a separate existence (we will not call it a "life") so that his agents (street corner hang-outs and commercial entertainments, e.g.) may have the children at their mercy. The ideal would possibly be to pull up roots and form a Cana village or some sort of Christian community. Since that is not possible (nor wise on several counts) it is up to families to attack the individualism of their respective localities and to form a community of Christian specifications out of the neighborhood they live in.

How to Do It?

Unity that is satisfactory and sanctifying can be achieved only through Christ. Christ is the only true bond—between man and God, between man and man. Christ alone can weld society together; all other unifying forces are just paper clips.

Therefore, preeminently, husbands and wives, parents and children, families within the neighborhood, must meet and be joined in Christ. Practically, this means that Christian family people must be of one mind; they must have thought enough about the ideal of unity to have the same ideas about the matter. Ideas necessarily precede action. They must be convinced of two things: that only by community life within the home and within the neighborhood will their family lives be satisfactory and satis-

lying; that only by Christian theory can soul be knit to soul so that the web of community life might be woven.

AS REGARDS FAMILY LIFE

It will help to keep in mind that the family is to be a "little Church" and that the home should reflect the community spirit that is in the Church of Christ. Thus (as Fr. Suso Meyer, O.S.B., explained in his Grail lectures this summer), since the Church is a community of love, a community of prayer, a community of work, a community of sacrifice, and a community of joy, the family must be bound together in each of these ways.¹

a. *Love.* The family is the basic social unit of the Mystical Body whose bond is the Spirit of Love. Each member of the family is to have a deep and real affection for the other members. Competition and antagonism have no place with love in the home. It must, moreover, be a love that is manifested in word and action.

b. *Prayer.* A family that doesn't pray together has little chance of achieving satisfactory unity. And since the union of the family is accomplished only in Christ, the most effective prayer-bond is the Mass. In the great act of the holy Sacrifice husband and wife, parents and children are welded into a mystic unity that has the greatest reality. Once the father accepts his position as the house-

hold "*sacerdos*" (giver of holy things) the offering of the Sacrifice will radiate into the private prayer-life of the family.

c. *Work.* In Christian thought work has a religious value. Work is not something to be avoided at all costs, but is rather an opportunity to atone for sin, to help oneself toward personal perfection, and to show charity toward others. In the home, moreover, it can become a bond of unity. There is work to be done in the home; to do it as a family project is to use work as a means of bringing every member of the family closer together.

d. *Sacrifice.* The law of suffering is especially operative in the family. Without a spirit of sacrifice home life will be impossible. So many diverse personalities will of necessity have to make some sacrifices in order to live in peace and happiness under one roof. Parents and children should all understand that in consequence of fallen nature, it is necessary to sacrifice themselves for the welfare of the family community.

e. *Joy.* Since the Church, like St. Paul, is "sorrowful yet always rejoicing," the family must have within itself a perpetual spring of joy. Peace, gaiety of spirit, song, laughter and festal occasions are nowhere more at home than in the home. The spirit of joy will inevitably follow family love, prayer, work and sacrifice.

How can the neighborhood be

¹ Fr. Suso's lectures are as yet unpublished; this section reflects some of his thought.

turned into a Christian community? The answer is along the same lines as that given above for renewing the family. The association of people living in the same locality must be made Christian by binding families together through love, prayer, work, sacrifice and joy.

a. *Love.* "By this shall all men know. . . ." The extreme individualism which refuses to be genuinely interested in the neighbor is un-Christian. We must bring back a sincere affection of neighbors one for the other.

b. *Prayer.* Neighborhoods should pray together. The best prayer-bond for neighborhoods is the Mass. The recited and sung Mass when seen as a community project has tremendous possibilities for molding community spirit and community action. Communal recitation of part of the divine office would add to the effectiveness of the prayer-bond.

c. *Work.* A community ought to work together if the members are to have the security of neighborly help in need.

d. *Sacrifice.* Turning a neighborhood into a Christian community will mean hardship on the part of some individuals. A certain self-forgetfulness, a kind of humility, is necessary for cooperation with others. But the fruits of the undertaking far outweigh the coin of sacrifice that must be paid for them.

e. *Joy.* The members of a Chris-

tian neighborhood should rejoice together. Song and dance (not modern dancing, which is a most inartistic expression of excessive individualism), games and feasts will serve to knit neighbors together.

HELP FROM ON HIGH

The strength and vision to do what is necessary for renewing family life and for re-forming the Christian community comes to married people from the Sacrament of Matrimony. Matrimony is not usually thought of as an apostolic sacrament, yet in reality it is just that. So often we think that a young person is lost to the apostolate when he marries. That is untrue.

The Sacrament of Matrimony gives to its recipients special, practical graces for doing all those daily things which are necessary to make a Christian success of marriage. That sacramental grace is a tremendous reality. Unfortunately, it can lie largely unused when married people do not intelligently avail themselves of it. To put matrimonial grace into operation, married people must see the Christian objective clearly before them; then, confident that God will supply the help from on high in virtue of their Sacrament, they must act courageously to renew their own home lives and re-form the neighborhood in which they live.

Every married person should be an apostle. Unto that are married Christians called. Grace does not destroy

but builds on nature. Through matrimony the natural affection of parents for their children is supernaturalized, is directed into Christian channels. And therefore, since environment is so critical for the development of the child, the Christian parent should be determined to go through hell and high water to make the social order (but especially his own neighborhood) a fit place for children to grow in.

In the past we have possibly overlooked the sacramental grace stored up in Matrimony which has been waiting until our own day to flood and flush this world of ours. Only when couples realize their apostolic vocation in married life and activate the grace that is theirs will the modern world be saved for Christ. This is in a pre-eminent way the era of Catholic Action.



Today's Task

"Today the Church in America—and it appears that the pattern is the same throughout much of the world—is entering a new age. Today it must make itself most definitely the champion of the poor, the underprivileged and the oppressed. The clergy of the past two generations were the builders of the churches and the schools and the convents. They did their job and they did it well.

But why didn't they preach the social reforms demanded by Leo XIII? Why didn't they denounce the appalling injustices of the economic order that cursed the nation in their day? True, a few of them did, and today they stand out like giants. But was the Church of the past in a position to challenge the established order? Recall the Presidential campaign of 1928. Today that spirit of hate is not yet dead but it will never again, we hope, reach the intensity of 1928.

However, today we must even risk its rise. We must challenge injustice wherever it exists. The shape of a new world is being hammered out by many powerful forces and it falls to the Church, now standing practically alone, to shape that world to the principles of justice and charity of Christ."—*Joseph F. Connelly in THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, July, 1945.*

Has Latin America Grown Up Politically?

PETER MASTEN DUNNE, S. J.

Reprinted from *The HISTORICAL BULLETIN**

THE word "politically" has been put first in the title of these reflective paragraphs and not without reason, for it will help to clarify our thinking. Culturally, large sections of the more representative citizens of these American republics have been grown up for centuries. They were adult, culturally, long before the blessings of independence came to them and were regularly superior in this matter to the Anglo-American of the north. In what we may call humanism in its best sense—in the appreciation and cultivation of certain refinements, spiritual and intellectual, of human living; in philosophy, in literature, in art—the educated *criollo* and the *mestizo* of mentally cultivated background has always been superior.

So it is with the refined and educated Latin generally, whether of this western hemisphere or of its mother, the small European portion of the eastern hemisphere. The quality of French culture is clear from the record of history, as is the Spanish *siglo de oro*. From both these traditions, especially from the French, educated Latin Americans have drunk deep draughts of spirit culture, either by going to the source itself in Europe

or by the perusal of European masterpieces in the schools or in the homes of America. In the Latin portions of the Western Hemisphere a poet is with honor even in his own country. The whole world turns out to glorify a deceased Nicaraguan bard, Rubén Dario (1867-1916), proclaimed and honored by twenty nations. The same twenty republics know, read and love the deep-souled contemporary, the Chilean Gabriela Mistral, and, when this lady dies, there will be more ado in the press of Latin America than over the demise of a movie actress or the passing of a multi-millionaire.

Where in this hemisphere of the West can be found creations upon the canvas which rival those of the colonial Gregorio Vásquez (1638-1711) or of the moderns, Azevedo Bernal or Father Santiago Páramo. These conceptions in line, color and human feature surpass anything the North has produced; they rival or, mayhap, surpass the masterpieces of a Raphael or a Botticelli. And so Colombia is rightly proud of these her cultured children. Brazil has long ago given proof of her cultured maturity in the delightful forms chiseled from soft stone by the mulatto Aleijadinho

* St. Louis University, St. Louis 3, Mo., November, 1947.

(1750-1830), while the sculptured or moulded beauty of the colonial Caspicara of Ecuador sweeten and elevate the nation's shrines. José Luis Zorrilla de San Martín, our contemporary of the twentieth century, has adorned the plazas of his native Uruguay and of Argentina with the strong and stalwart forms his chisel has hewn in stone or his hands have moulded from clay.

What can replace in this hemisphere those spirit-melting madonnas which perfume with prayerful devotion the sanctuaries that are richly sprinkled along the west coast of the southern continent; or what wealth of art can compare with the moulded facades and the ornate and gilded altars of Mexico and Peru! Even the Anglo-Saxon can sometimes admire such beauty, though he has not been able to create it. Therefore in these human values, and even in colonial times, the Latin American was already matured, while his Anglo cousin of the north, because of different background and racial character, was as yet but a child.

THEORY AND PRACTICE

Politically, the record has been quite different. In the pragmatic organization and evolution of the democratic state it has taken the Latin American a long time to mature. To be sure, these well-educated Latin men of refined spirit have most often been the leaders of their people, and

their keen and supple intelligence has fructified, even politically, in constructive theories of law, arbitration and international order. We have the Drago Doctrine, fathered by Luis María Drago of Argentina (1859-1921), approved by the third Pan-American Congress of 1906, and incorporated as part of international law by the second Hague Conference in 1907. The Gondra Treaty of 1923, originating with Manuel A. Gondra of Paraguay, made an important addition to constructive diplomatic processes among the American nations.

In political theory history's record of the Latin-American contribution is splendid; not, however, in the practice. In the application of the theory Latins have been deficient. During early independence years they were not able to organize a government which was stable without being dictatorial; which could be democratic without division and corruption. Here the Latin American has faltered and so the question is posed whether he has yet arrived at mature estate, or is still a growing and developing child. Apart from the leaders the question is asked whether the people are sufficiently intelligent, restrained and law-abiding in practice to warrant their being organized into a successful democratic government. Both as to leaders and to people the answer cannot always be in the affirmative, not always—we are dealing with twenty governments.

It is clear that in the beginning of independence democracy had to be infantile or completely inoperative. How could it have been otherwise? Without previous practice in a difficult art, self-government, one cannot be expected to operate other than clumsily or to operate not at all, in spite of theories and subjective desires. This previous practice did not exist for Latin Americans. For centuries these peoples had lived under the absolutist monarchies of Spain or of Portugal. The dim and tiny spark remaining over from the Middle Ages, a remnant of democratic practice in the town *cabildo*, was extinguished early in the sixteenth century by Charles V.

But even if the leaders had enjoyed a previous experience in statesmanship, the task of national democratic organization would still have been difficult, especially in certain regions or countries, because of the character of the people. In Paraguay, Bolivia, Peru and Ecuador the very large Indian population, with its lethargic and backward psychology, precluded millions from intelligent participation in any form of republican government. In Haiti and the Dominican Republic the attractive, but untutored, psychology of the Negro acted with similar negative results. In addition to the inability of the native races to cooperate with free institutions there was the great mass of the poor, illiterate and often unstable and unreliable

mestizos. Then again, among the better conditioned and educated *mestizos* and among the *criollos* of unmixed European but Latin blood there existed at the beginning of independence another obstacle to government in free and orderly processes: the individualistic, emotional and often unrealistic psychology of the Latin.

Individualism, of course, is most often only a euphemistic name for egotism and pride, as unconstructive as it is un-Christian. This psychology affected in the beginning of independence both the leaders and the upper brackets of the people in a manner as to disrupt democratic forms. For, since it was strongly emotional, it led to a fanatical attachment to one's own ideas, or to one's own party, or to a leader, an attachment in which compromise was out of the question. It led to fierce antagonism against the proposals or the persons of the opposition. It accepted criticism (part and parcel of free speech amid free institutions) in bad grace, as a personal insult, and so it bred passionate anger. All this gave a keen edge among the leaders to the already existing propensity towards a fatal division and disruption. Amidst the people, where egotism and resentment of criticism did not so often apply, there was still an explosive emotionalism which likewise is essentially disruptive. This would cause them to follow a leader blindly as against another leader (fruit in the masses of personalism);

it formed the soil out of which the demagogue or the *caudillo* sprang. All in all, there was in those early days a lack of that cohesive quality without which states cannot solidly endure.

SOME POLITICAL LEADERS

Add to the above other things true to type: an over-weening ambition in many of the leaders, as with Iturbide and Santa Anna of Mexico; a flaming and destructive glory-lust and power-madness, as was seen in the early *caudillos* of Paraguay, Doctor Francia (1814-1840), for instance, and the younger López (1862-1870) whose crazy career ruined his country, and in the latest dictators of Venezuela, Guzmán Blanco (1873-1888) and Juan Vicente Gómez (1909-1935). For many and many a decade among the politicians there were careerism, violent partisanship, legislation for party only, factionalism, and deliberate and selfish obstruction of parliamentary processes. Among the smaller people as also among the higher officials a lack of integrity and civic virtue injured the prosperity of nations so that, for instance, under the really democratic regime in Argentina of President Hipólito Irigoyen and his Liberal Party (1916-1930) the machine of state became impregnated with corruption.

These are some of the reasons why politically Latin America was infantile during the first decades of its freedom after 1810. Politically it was

unable to walk, even to crawl. The two great leaders of independence of the north and of the south, respectively, Simón Bolívar and José de San Martín, were not deceived regarding these defects in their countrymen. Thus San Martín favored rather a constitutional monarchy headed by some European prince, while Bolívar had in mind a strongly centralized government in which the president of the republic would enjoy practically dictatorial powers. The constitution he drew up for the newly created Bolivia in 1825 embodies the ideas of the great Liberator.

During the early decades of political frustration in the new states of Latin America there were two notable exceptions. Chile enjoyed a continuous and relatively prosperous government for sixty years, thirty under a Conservative and thirty under a Liberal regime. Then after 1891 it lapsed for some decades into discontinuity and confusion. Brazil was the other exception. After some initial growing pains the stalwart but liberal personality of Emperor Dom Pedro II (1831-1889) blessed Brazil, after his coming of age, with forty-nine years of peaceful and prosperous government. Dom Pedro's Austrian blood, through his mother, lent stability to his character, a quality admittedly recognized as often wanting in the Latin. When a barracks revolution overthrew the Emperor in his old and be-whiskered age, the army men and the

other politicians showed themselves unable to steer successfully the republican ship of state with cohesion, coolness and realism.

Spain stands in the modern history of Western Europe as an illuminating example of how such group characteristics and deficiencies in leaders and people can affect a state. Spain, without the drag of the Indian and the mixture of the *mestizo*, has still not even in the mid-twentieth century politically grown up and, perhaps, never will. Spain will not succeed in organizing a democratic regime until the character of its people changes. An exceedingly intelligent and cultured *disputado*, member of Uruguay's Chamber of Deputies, once said to the writer in Montevideo: "The difference between Latin America and the United States is this: our background has been Spanish, yours has been English."

San Martín and Bolívar, the fathers of independence, were therefore directed by a realistic intelligence when they harbored such serious misgivings; when they felt that the new states were not yet ready for the functioning of free institutions. Indeed, Bolívar's own created state, to which he gave his name, its first constitution, and its geographical limits early in the nineteenth century, had not yet grown up politically by the middle of the twentieth. Her first president and the right arm of Bolívar, General Antonio José de Sucre, could not maintain

himself against the assault in 1826 of dictator Santa Cruz. This *caudillo* was able, moreover, amidst Peru's dissensions, divisions, civil wars and general political helplessness, to march in, take over the country, and unite it with Bolivia. Santa Cruz was himself overthrown at the end of the following decade. New instruments of government were fabricated in Bolivia and new dictators forced themselves upon the country in a sort of kaleidoscopic rapidity. It was during this period of utter confusion that a ruffian and thug-like dictator, the illegitimate *mestizo*, Mariano Melgarejo (1865-1871), tossed himself into the presidential chair. From her beginning in 1825 to 1880 Bolivia had drawn up ten constitutions, and before the close of the century she had been harassed by sixty revolutions, a series of international wars, and had witnessed the assassination of six of her presidents.

The twentieth century sees the country not yet grown up. In 1937 President Toro was overthrown by an army coup; President Busch committed suicide two years later; succeeding President Peñaranda was driven from office in 1943 by a revolt of the National Revolutionary Party; and finally the incoming Villaroel regime sat uneasily in the chair of power, weathering an uprising, until it too was violently brought down in July, 1946. During this, Bolivia's latest revolution, the erstwhile President was surrounded in his palace and

shot. Then an angry mob dragged his body into the street and hanged the bleeding corpse to a lamppost. The new President, Henrique Hertzog, was elected amid some disturbances during which the bleeding and dying body of a citizen was paraded through the streets. Shortly after the elections which were held in January, 1947, President Hertzog felt himself forced into the familiar pattern of arrests and deportations, visited upon leading politicians for alleged subversive activities. Politically, Bolivia has not yet grown up.

Paraguay suffered agonies from 1816 to 1870, throttled as it was by three successive dictators, Doctor José Gaspar Francia (1814-1840) and the two López, father and son (1840-1862 and 1862-1870, respectively). The second López, Francisco Solano, glory-mad, provoked a war with three nations at once, Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay, during which the country was obliterated while the nation lost the almost incredible proportion of five-sixth of its male population. After the 1870's and well up through the 1920's the government suffered, because of personal or political antagonisms, twelve upheavals. President Higinio Morínigo, chosen late in 1943, has since been obliged to withstand in his capital city of Asunción the political riotings of university students joined with unions of workers, the agitations of liberal or radical politicians, and the sputterings of revolt

which have crackled menacingly from time to time. From March through August, 1947, Paraguay treated history to the sorry spectacle of a full-dressed civil war, during which President Morínigo was driven from his capital city and all but overthrown.

DICTATOR-RIDDEN

The little countries of Central America, with the exception of Costa Rica, have been dictator-ridden almost continuously from the start, and the mid-twentieth century has witnessed such centralized and tyrannical regimes as those of Jorge Ubico (1931-1944) in Guatemala, of Tiburcio Carías Andino (1932-) in Honduras, and of Anastasio Somoza (1936-) in Nicaragua. In the Dominican Republic General Rafael Leonidas Trujillo has dominated the government since 1930 and although the names of successive paper-presidents have appeared to guide the ship of state, Trujillo has seen to it that he remains at the rudder very effectively indeed and has retained within his strong and able hands all the threads which manipulate the various units of the political machine. He too has been afflicted with that glory-lust so familiar to his type and has changed the venerable and sonorous name of the oldest capital in America, Santo Domingo to the cheap and paltry Ciudad Trujillo.

Throughout Latin America generally, governments continue to be over-

turned. Just as the depression of 1929 toppled over half a dozen regimes, so during the course of World War II and its aftermath revolution swept through many countries: Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Venezuela, Haiti, Guatemala, Panama and, most recently, Ecuador. Each in its turn saw presidents or dictators fall, while mutterings or crises ruffled the regime of other nations, except where the strong hand of a dictator scotched rebellion, or where, as in Chile, Colombia, Peru, Mexico and Costa Rica, more stable governments carried on through the processes of orderly, if not always free and democratic, elections.

History's record, therefore, of most of the smaller countries attests that well into the mid-twentieth century they had not yet grown up politically. Some of the more important nations have begun to show themselves somewhat more mature. They have grown out of their early chaotic or disorganized condition. Take Argentina, for instance. It took her a long time to develop and become organized. There had been rapid changes in the form of government since the first days of independence; there had been a tyrannical dictatorship, that of Juan Manuel Rosas (1835-1852); and the potentially rich country was everlastingly torn in conflict between *gaucho* and *porteño*, the provinces and the capital city, Buenos Aires.

Argentina did not receive its name and was not born as a united nation

until the conflict ceased and the *porteño* leader, Bartolomé Mitre, defeated in battle in 1860, was willing to accept with slight changes Alberdi's Constitution in 1853. Notwithstanding, Mitre rose again in 1861 and, victorious this time, was made president the following year. Unfortunately Mitre rebelled once again in 1864 and still again in 1880. Bartolomé Mitre, estimable in many respects, a man of letters and a scholar, author of a many-volumed and classical history of his country, still politically was victim of that intolerant and intransigent attitude which has bedeviled the politics of all Latin-American countries. Argentina, proud of its wealth and boastful of its "white" blood, required decades in order to begin to walk as a nation.

Your Latin has, by and large, shown himself a poor loser. He has not been able to bear defeat and so he has rebelled. And the psychology is still apperent. In Argentina, by law, a soccer football field must be surrounded by a fence and moat lest the angry crowds flow down into the field and maul a player or kill an umpire. People have been slain in football riots, Argentine referees have been shot, and grandstands and buildings have been burned down. British influence and its spirit of fair play have exercised an ameliorating influence upon Argentina's soccer fields. Transfer such unrestrained psychology into politics and many things become un-

derstandable. Churchmen were Latins, too. An intransigent spirit led José Santiago Zorrilla, Archbishop of Santiago, Chile, to agitate against independence until he had to be exiled from the country. Returned, he agitated once again. The same psychology, blent with other motives and emotions, drove Archbishop Fonte of Mexico City to abandon his flock in early independence days and to return to Spain. Numbers of the higher clergy did the same so that between desertion and death the ranks of the American hierarchy became seriously depleted to the injury of the Latin-American church, a hurt from which it was far from recovered well into the twentieth century.

Republican Brazil suffered initial and serious growing pains. The man most responsible for the 1889 revolution, Manoel Deodoro da Fonseca, was chosen first president of the infant republic. He showed himself utterly incapable of guiding the ship of state. Sensitive and explosive, he took criticism of state policy as a personal hurt or insult, he quarreled with his congress, then dissolved it, and assumed dictatorial powers while rebellion flared in the provinces. The Republic was four years old when the Brazilian fleet moved against the installed government and blockaded Rio de Janeiro. Gradually conditions simmered down with sputterings from time to time punctuated more sharply by the revolution and civil war of

1922 and by the revolution and subsequent dictatorship of Getulio Vargas (1930-1945). Shortly after one of the early republican elections in Brazil, during which campaigning turned to white heat, while dishonest manipulations and corruption sank to a new bottom, a Brazilian wag remarked that to the contending parties nothing seemed criminal except losing the election!

MEXICO

Mexico among the larger nations has been marked by the saddest historical record. For decades the only president to fill out his term of office was the first, Guadalupe Victoria (1824-1828). Even before this regime, during it, and almost forever after there were crises, "plans," revolts, constitutions and dictatorships; there were foreign wars with the loss of Texas and the extensive northwestern provinces; there was the frightfulness of the civil war, the *Guerra de la Reforma* (1857-1862), during which both Liberals and Conservatives, engaged in a death struggle, appealed to an outside power; there was the imperial interlude of the hapless Hapsburg Maximilian, the return of the Liberals, and then at long last stability and (for the small class of the upper people at least) prosperity during the long dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz (1876-1911).

The career in Mexico of Antonio López de Santa Anna, with his showy

and ephemeral triumphs, his military defeats, his ten revolts, his successive dictatorships, and his eight expulsions from the country with as many returns—these events of a fitful and tumultuous career demonstrate the early political impotency of Mexico. In the face of this record there are Mexicans, especially among the clergy, who place the responsibility for national failure upon the government of the United States.

History, therefore, has demonstrated that Bolívar and San Martín were right when they realized that the newborn American nations were not yet ready for the enjoyment of free institutions. We have noted the exceptions of the unitarist government of Chile and of the Brazilian Empire and we have pointed to later progress in some other nations. The more consoling theme of political development can now be further amplified. The more recent career of certain American republics shows that they *have* grown up, indeed that they have long reached maturity. Costa Rica developed politically long ago. Ever since the dictatorship of Tomás Guardia (1870-1882) the country has suffered but two revolts (1917 and 1919 respectively) while its conservative or unitarist constitution of 1871 has carried on with but slight alterations. Since 1919 in Costa Rica (with one slight exception) president has followed president in peaceful fashion and under the free ballot. The Liberal

Teodoro Picardo was elected in 1944 and early in 1947 the Republicans nominated his predecessor, Calderón Guardia, as their candidate for the 1948 elections.

The political career of Chile has been for a major length of time one of relative political stability. Towards the mid-twentieth century the nation has enjoyed successive orderly elections. Chile's history has run in periods of three decades: the Conservative regime (1831-1861), the Liberal (1861-1891), then three decades of unrest, winding up with almost two decades of the sporadic dominance of Arturo Alessandri (1920-1938). Later presidents, Aguirre Cerda (1938-1941), who died before his term ran out; Juan Antonio Ríos (1942-1946), who likewise died in office; and Gabriel González Videla, elected in April, 1947, have carried Chile along a stable course distinguished by progressive social legislation.

Uruguay in the nineteenth century suffered the usual divisions and turmoils produced by excessive individualism and acrid partisanship. The country suffered repeated outbreaks which sometimes led to civil war, the protagonists being the classical parties, the Conservatives, the *Blancos*, and the Liberals, the *Colorados*. Then, early in the twentieth century, Uruguay rapidly grew up. She became an adult in matters political as she had long been in matters of refined intelligence and culture. Largely re-

sponsible for this was the eminent statesman the *Colorado*, José Battle (pronounced Baje), who reformed his Liberal party and dominated Uruguayan politics from 1903 to 1931. Under this enlightened leadership Uruguay outpaced the American nations of both continents in the excellence of her social legislation. It is true that during the 1930's the ship of state was tossed by storms. The *Colorados* split, there was a period of rule by decree, a new constitution, rebellion, and renewed dictatorship. But politics became reasonable again in the 1940's and after quiet elections the *Colorado*, Tomás Berreta, was inaugurated in March, 1947. When he died the first week of the following August, Vice-President Luis Battle, nephew of the famed Liberal, quietly succeeded to the presidential chair.

PAPAL CONCORDAT

Colombia, agitated during earlier decades, has enjoyed a larger measure of political tranquility than perhaps any other Latin-American nation. The long Conservative regime (1886-1930) helped stabilize the nation. The thorny State-Church relationship did not agitate politics here as in other countries, for a concordat with the Holy See, then occupied by the liberal-minded Leo XIII, was drawn up along lines which were generous and satisfactory to the State. Points for which Mexico fought her terrible *Guerra de la Reforma* were in this

Colombian instrument conceded to the State. When the Liberals came to power in 1930, they respected the document, while Conservatives and churchmen knew how to cooperate with the new regime. Discontent and agitation under President Alfonso López led to his resignation in 1945 and in the following year the fifty-five year old millionaire business man, Mariano Ospina Pérez, was returned at the polls. It was the first time in sixteen years that the Conservatives dominated Colombian politics.

Political development has brightened the recent picture likewise in other countries. Haiti has grown out of her early ferocious dictators and violent, bloody successions. In Cuba Fulgencio Batista, "the king-maker," who had long been the power behind successive presidents, himself took office in 1940 after elections had been twice postponed and a new constitution fabricated. Near the end of his four-year term Batista announced that he would not run again. It was a unique gesture. In 1944 he allowed untrammelled elections, which resulted in the victory of a former president, Grau San Martin.

Peru has suffered its share of internal troubles well into the twentieth century. In the 1936 elections the *Aprista* candidate, party leader Haya de la Torre, whose advanced social program was considered radical by the Conservatives in power, was barred from entering the presidential race.

While the votes were being counted (by the party in power, of course) it was seen that the Conservative candidate was not leading. Government, thereupon, fearing revolt, announced that the count would be discontinued and simply extended the term of Conservative President Benavides for another three years. An attempted revolt led to elections in 1939 in which the Conservative Manuel Prado was chosen, the *Aprista* party again being barred. But in the 1940's there was progress. The *Apristas* were allowed to return from their exile in Chile and to participate in the 1945 campaign which culminated in the election of coalition candidate Dr. José Luis Bustamante. Three *Apristas* received cabinet portfolios.

Such new-born serenity has marked the politics of other countries, too. In Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, and elsewhere, presidential elections of the later 1940's have been orderly and quiet, even though unfair tactics have been resorted to (except in Brazil) by the party in power against the opposition candidate. In Argentina early in 1946 there was unfair discrimination against the Liberal candidate, José Tamborini, in the use of radio, placards and other means of campaign publicity. Owing to this unfair play and aided by the mistakes of the Liberals themselves and of the American Ambassador, Spruille Braden, Colonel Juan D. Perón was elected to the presidency and proceeded to consoli-

date a tyrannical dictatorship. In Mexico the bitter strife against the Church has of late years ceased, while from the 1920's forward the elections have been progressively quiet. However, since the shaping of the 1917 constitution the National Revolutionary Party, changed by President Cárdenas into the National Party of Workers and Soldiers, has always taken very careful care that its own candidate win at the polls regardless of the will of the people. Indeed, free and untrammelled campaigning and elections have by and large been a rare occurrence in Latin America. The party in power has usually seen to it that it remains in, while the "outs" remain out.

CHURCH AND STATE

Churchmen, too, in Latin America have developed politically. The Church has been beaten down in some countries, notably in Venezuela in the nineteenth century and in Mexico in the twentieth. Some of the responsibility for the acrid quality of Church-State troubles in the past reposes upon the shoulders of churchmen because of their intransigent attitude vis-a-vis the modern national state. During the earlier decades of the nineteenth century in Latin countries, atheistic Liberalism harbored a spirit of rancor and intolerance, while Masonry was actuated by hate and fanaticism. In opposing such a spirit many churchmen and some popes allowed

themselves to be pushed into an attitude of more or less narrow reaction. Many churchmen in Latin America tried to hold uncompromisingly to hoary privileges and stirred political turmoil when these were attacked. This strife between Conservative and Liberal, Clerical and anti-Clerical, became frightfully embittered. It led to grave consequences both for Church and State, retarded the political development of free institutions, and in some instances provoked bloody civil war. In these matters the twentieth century has seen an improvement and the relationship continued to fare better as the century swung to its middle period. Separation of Church and State has solved the problem in some countries, as in Uruguay and Brazil. In Argentina and Colombia the Church long ago has learned to get along with the State and to participate in its liberal social program, while the State has learned to be less fanatical in its opposition to the Church (in Venezuela, for instance) and to lay aside its formerly vicious anti-clericalism. In Chile Monseñor Caro, Arch-

bishop of Santiago, aided the Popular Front government of President Cerda for the social uplift of the ragged *roto*. In Colombia the Archbishop of Bogotá and the Papal Nuncio cooperated with the former Liberal government, while the Liberals in their turn assumed a friendly attitude towards the Church and respected the Concordat of 1887. This is a far advance from the dark days of the nineteenth century.

Judging, then, from the record of the past it may be admissible to state that, given the backward conditions of certain countries, the mixture of race in many republics, the high measure of illiteracy in not a few, and considering the individualistic (therefore divisive) and emotional (therefore unstable) quality of Latin and *mestizo* alike, it may be long before political maturity will come to flower in each one of the American nations. Some seem long ago to have matured, progress there has been in all, a measure of stability attained in most. The future, therefore, seems bright with promise.

U. S. Foreign Policy

"We of the Congress of Industrial Organizations are determined to continue to work for international peace, for the adoption and implementation of the Marshall Plan, for a strengthened United Nations."—*From a statement adopted by the CIO Executive Board, January 22, 1948.*

Money for the Millions

RAYMOND BERNARD, S.J.

*Reprinted from COLUMBIA**

ONE dime started the evolution of one of the greatest finance operations this country has ever seen.

People laughed when they heard that Alphonse DesJardins, the Quebec journalist who had earnestly studied the problem of usury for fifteen years, had seen his labors and long propaganda result in a "fiasco." Trained and experienced in newspaper work, DesJardins turned away to seek a remedy for the money-lending abuses so widespread in his day. He made voyages to Europe, consulted famous English, Italian and German leaders in cooperation. He had studied, written harangued, pleaded again and again as selflessly as a saint. And now in 1900, at the start of his little experiment, the first deposit was a single dime and the total collection amounted to only \$26—no wonder criticism and offensive comment and dire prophecies flew about his head.

But the unchecked extortion compelling poor borrowers in Montreal and elsewhere to pay usurers 300 per cent on small loans drove the dreamer on despite the discouraging laughter.

By traveling up and down the province of Quebec and talking to

pastors and farmers, fishermen and factory hands, the crusading journalist spread the story of the humble project begun in his home at Levis. Before war broke out in 1914, more than 150 credit unions, or People's Banks as the Canadians call them, had grown up without a single loss and today Quebec shelters 932 credit unions with 385,000 members and assets of \$125,000,000.

From Quebec's parish models the movement spread steadily across the continent. DesJardins himself organized the first credit union in the United States in 1908 at Manchester, New Hampshire, in cooperation with the priest of St. Marie parish and aided similar parish enterprises at Lynn, Lowell, Lawrence and New Bedford, Massachusetts. One by one the states took up People's Banks—New York, North Carolina, Texas, Wisconsin, Oregon, South Carolina, Utah, Nebraska in the early years—until today they average 200 to a state.

Why this phenomenal growth from DesJardin's dime? When a group of needy people learn this way out of unreasonable debt, the credit union comes as an answer to prayer. Experience shows them all too often the dangers they face. Court records in

* New Haven 7, Conn., June, 1947

your own city probably would reveal finance racketeering like that which crushed a Massachusetts widow and her daughter. The woman borrowed \$300 from a licensed loan company to pay her daughter's college tuition. For ten years thereafter she paid the loan company \$2,212. Her debt remained unpaid and the company had a mortgage on all the widow's furniture.

LOAN SHARKS AND LAW SUITS

Another case growing from a modest start comes to light in the story of the housewife in an eastern city who borrowed \$50 from an illegal lender. She was to pay \$10 in interest—a mere 20 per cent a week. But in a week she could not repay. Then she owed \$60. Another week and the debt jumped to \$72—and the lender kindly let the housewife have more money. Desperate, the woman withdrew money from her brother's account, later forging \$2,500 worth of her mother's postal certificates. Two years later she had paid \$4,395 on an actual debt of \$250, when federal authorities arrested her for forgery and conspiracy.

Records for the Municipal Court of Minneapolis showed not long ago that in less than one year loan sharks had instituted 1,845 suits against borrowers. Investigation of these cases disclosed that interest rates varied from 33 per cent to 1,353 per cent, averaging 218.4 per cent. One

railroad employe had borrowed \$30, paid back \$1,080 in interest and was then sued for the original \$30.

Unscrupulous money lenders are neither a modern nor a local pest. A yellowed sheet of ancient Egyptian hieroglyphics records the promise of a farmer to pay the village loan shark 200 bushels of wheat for the loan of 100, setting stiff penalties for default—the debtor and his family could even be taken into slavery. China, India, Africa and Europe long suffered from usury. Universally today the credit union makes its appeal to the oppressed poor. Before Pearl Harbor, Japan had more than 17,000 credit unions; Germany, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Finland and czarist Russia ranked among the top credit union countries. However, Soviet Russia is a question mark on the co-op list because of her high-handed tactics with democratic principles.

Back in 15th century Italy Blessed Bernardin of Feltra, a Franciscan monk, set about to increase the meager money resources of the poor. With gold begged from wealthy nobles and merchants he established the *Monte de Pietà*, special funds from which the poor might borrow. This example of Catholic concern and disinterestedness led many others to take up the work, inspiring DesJardins the journalist some 500 years later.

Few people even among its growing membership understand just what

the modern credit union is. Primarily a credit union is a cooperative association of people who want to help each other. If it can snatch its members from high-rate money lenders, it rescues them. If it can save money in minor matters, it benefits them. If social activity is wanted, it furnishes social activity—it aids its members in many ways, *because its first aim is to serve.*

This fundamental objective comes into clear focus in these words of a young department store worker: "I used the credit union to help me get a fine wife, to go on a honeymoon, to furnish my home, to build a house, to bring my son into the world, and to get me an old jalopy so that I can take my young family out into the country of a Saturday afternoon. And during the process I never stopped saving and have, right now, with all loans paid, \$785 in my share account." An Arkansas refinery worker found all his havings swept away when his three-year-old son went down deathly ill with tetanus—his hopes for a special costly serum waned. Then a credit union member heard of the predicament. A loan was put at the disposal of the worried worker, the serum was rushed in and the little tot was saved.

The stories of credit union wonders are almost endless. One hundred families in Pueblo, Colorado, saved their homes through their parish credit union's help. Negro rural com-

munities in Louisiana, Texas, North Carolina and Mississippi have helped their people far beyond their dreams. Today credit union activity spreads in Hawaii like wildfire, among teachers and poor native pineapple and sugar plantation hands. Jamaica has thirty-two unions among its natives, with five times as many in formation.

One of the most promising young workers in the United States, Lee J. O'Brien, managing director of the Missouri Credit Union League, has defined the credit union neatly. O'Brien calls it "a cooperative society, operating within a group of people who have a strong common bond, supplying its members with four primary services: 1) an easy and convenient system for accumulating savings; 2) a source of credit at reasonable rates of interest; 3) a school wherein the members are educated in the management of money; and 4) an instrument with which the members can control their own wealth." This Catholic promoter symbolizes these aims by four words: *thrift, credit, education, control.*

A closer look at a credit union in action shows that it is organized like a club: one member, one vote, with officers chosen from the membership. Participation is open to anyone within a particular group, regardless of race, color, sex or creed, in true accord with the traditional Rochdale principles. A board of directors elected by members sets the policies of the

group, while a treasurer appointed by them takes care of business details. Every loan application must be passed on by a credit committee. The test for getting a loan is character, not collateral.

The financial soundness of the credit union is watched over in several ways. The union must be incorporated under state or federal law. A supervisory committee independent of the treasurer inspects the books periodically. A state or federal official examines them once a year. All officers handling money are bonded. Incidentally, the officers usually serve without pay. Business expenses are low. Interest rates are never higher than one per cent a month on unpaid balances. Earnings defray expenses, set up a reserve fund against uncollectible loans and pay dividends on savings accounts. Practically every state has laws to govern credit unions.

CREDIT UNION MEMBERS

Who make up the membership in these credit self-servers? Catholics by the hundreds of thousands in Canada, where parish priests have so zealously sponsored local units. Besides the 478 Catholic credit unions in this country (Protestants have 71, Jews 18) close observers think a hundred others nominally classed as community projects are actually sponsored by Catholic parishes. Such a one is the wide-famed Westphalia (Iowa) community. Group the three million Ameri-

can members by type of occupation and you find that most of them are factory workers and employees. Government workers come next in number, then food and beverage workers, public utility employes, persons in educational fields, then transportation workers. Telegraph and power companies alone sponsor more than 316 credit unions; the American railroads list 438, the United States Post Office 299 and the telephone companies 175.

You would find similar groups operating among lobstermen in Maine, airline pilots and clerks, UNRRA's international staff, workers in stores, movie studios, mail-order houses, packing houses, refineries, stove foundries, newspaper plants, alumni groups, steel mills and even in banks—twenty-one big banks have them, since state laws usually prevent banks from lending to their own employes. Labor unions sponsor their own credit unions. Everywhere you would find that common people, needy, self-reliant, determined and charitable, make up the democracy of the credit union.

The social value of the credit movement has long been recognized by the Church. Just as in Germany, Belgium, Italy and Switzerland now and in past years, so today various bishops have enthusiastically approved and promoted this popular finance plan. Bishop Aloisius J. Muench of Fargo has said: "Credit unions afford special opportunities to all members for the exercise of the two important vir-

tues of social justice and social charity, especially the latter. If credit unions have attained such great success, this must be attributed largely to the spirit of social charity that has actuated them." This esteemed prelate regards the principles of morality and religion as the very soul of the undertaking, without which it would die and decay. The Archbishop of St. Paul, John Gregory Murray, has urged support of the movement upon his pastors, parents and community as "a common cause that is worthy of the best effort of all concerned." The Bishops of Crookston and St. Cloud have praised credit unions highly and convincingly. Other Church leaders have commended them as powerful factors in the spread of the spirit of cooperation.

ACTIVE CREDIT UNION WORKERS

Many Catholic laymen actively assist in the credit union movement today in this country. Outstanding among them is modest Lee O'Brien of Kansas City, twice president of the national association of managing directors, who recently devoted a month of his time to assist the work down in Jamaica; Jim Barry, formerly the spark of the Kansas-Nebraska league and now in charge in Texas, graduate of Buffalo's Canisius College; Mary G. Dooling, head of the cooperative department on the St. Louis *Queen's Work* staff, launcher of credit unions and indoctrinator of

many a pastor and teacher; Agnes Gartland, director for Massachusetts, and Fabian Monroe, director for Wisconsin. Names of other leaders and promoters that come readily to mind are, of course, the trio of St. Francis Xavier's in Nova Scotia: Father "Jimmy" Tompkins, Monsignor M. M. Coady and A. B. MacDonald; Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara of Kansas City; Father Edgar Schmiedeler, O.S.B.; Father William Castel of Louisiana; Father William McCarthy of Colorado; Father William McGuire of New Mexico, and the Jesuit Fathers J. P. Sullivan in Jamaica and Marion Ganey in British Honduras.

If you want to see for yourself how things operate, drop in at the office of a credit union. In Chicago you may find a wealth of interesting information and knowledge—for example, at the Catholic Workers' Credit Union, or the Sheil School Credit Union or the St. Alphonse Credit Union. Ernest Ludwig, prominent behind all three groups, could tell you of others. In Milwaukee several notable parish groups are St. Elizabeth, St. Francis and Holy Angels. Then there's St. John's at Waterloo, Iowa, not far from the cooperative center at Westphalia; or St. Vincent's or St. Stephen's in Kansas City; or far away, there's St. Benedict's in Jamaica, Long Island, New York. Or St. Benedict the Moor's out in Omaha—or any of the

nearly five hundred Catholic units.

You can find credit unions established and functioning successfully in the Railway Express Agency, Armour Packing Company, Proctor & Gamble, Owens-Illinois Glass Company, Swift, Krogers Stores, Palmolive Peet, Union Pacific, Lever Brothers, Illinois Central, Marshall Field, Paramount Pictures, Sears Roebuck & Company, Western Electric. Many other industrial and business firms sponsoring credit unions are listed by CUNA, the Credit Union National Association based at Madison, Wisconsin, which serves the movement in this country. Literature, services and the help of experienced organizers coming from CUNA will add thousands of new names to the 10,000 flourishing unions. For the American movement is truly only in its infancy.

Expansion is bound to come, the confident leaders believe. The South, for instance, presents virgin country for the credit union organizer. Howard C. Custer, able editor of the movement's monthly organ, *Bridge*, says: "Leaders decided that the credit union movement would be most effectively promoted if the early stages of its development were centered in the areas of highest population concentration. This means that both the South and the Southwest have been relatively neglected." Rural sections generally look promising.

Hard times, forecast and feared by

many economists and statisticians at present, will actually help spread the idea, according to energetic Lee O'Brien, the Missouri leader. "I believe," says O'Brien, "that when depression hits us, our unemployment produces a great surge of community-feeling, a union of suffering and sympathy—and then we start seriously to help one another."

This state director and national leader points to the fact that the Missouri Credit Union League was formed in the dark days of 1932, grew steadily and today has member unions with assets of sixteen million dollars. The development in Germany 100 years ago took place when Herman Schulze-Delitzsch determined to help the poor of his impoverished town; Negro sharecroppers in North Carolina began their organization in the depression, and the experience of the Nova Scotian priests who started study clubs among the penniless fishermen parallels these achievements. In exactly the same situation a century ago the English pioneers at Rochdale started to help themselves. They have been helping themselves ever since.

Credit unions grow steadily in normal times and multiply phenomenally in hard times. The movement has the support and active cooperation of men and women who see its tremendous possibilities for the economic, social and spiritual well-being of millions of their fellow citizens.

Africa and the U. N.

CATHERINE SCHAEFER

*Reprinted from The AFRICAN ANGELUS**

SOME 300,000,000 people, or about one-eighth of the population of the world, are non-self-governing in the sense that they live in areas which are known as colonies, protectorates, mandates or trust territories. (We are not concerned here with those non-self-governing people who live under totalitarian regimes.) Of the figure listed, some 130,000,000 are in Africa, many of them in areas of great strategic importance and rich in natural products.

The welfare of all of this large group of people, and their progress toward eventual self-government have become a matter of international concern under the United Nations. This concern is manifested largely through the Trusteeship system, by which territories are placed by the administering power under the supervision of the Trusteeship Council of the U.N.—a body composed of an equal number of administering and non-administering countries, at present six of each. It is further manifested by a provision of the United Nations Charter under which all states responsible for the administration of non-self-governing territories (which are not trusteeships) recognize the principle

that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost the political, economic, social and educational advancement of those peoples, to develop self-government among them, and to make periodic reports to the Secretary-General of the United Nations with relation to economic, social and educational conditions within these territories.

The value of Africa for strategic and economic reasons has been recognized for a long time, but the welfare of the inhabitants was not generally considered as of primary importance, save by the missionaries. Toward the end of the nineteenth century the rivalry of European nations in Africa focused attention on the exploitation of the natives and the need for international action to safeguard their welfare, as well as on the need to establish the principle of equality of economic opportunity of the "colonial powers." Therefore, the Berlin Conference in 1885 on Congo affairs and the Brussels Conference in 1890 provided among other things for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade and freedom of navigation of the Con-

* 23 Bliss Ave., Tenaft, N. J., December, 1947

go and Niger Rivers, and the restriction of traffic in firearms, ammunition and spiritous liquors.

Following the end of World War I, with the establishment of the League of Nations, the Mandate System was born. Under this, colonies taken from Germany (as well as some lands belonging to Turkey, all of which have now gained independence, with the exception of Palestine) were put under international supervision. The administration of territories in central Africa not yet ready for self-government was given to certain victorious powers, under the so-called "Class B" Mandates. These powers had to guarantee in their administration "freedom of conscience and religion, subject only to the maintenance of public law and morals," the prohibition of the slave trade and of the traffic in arms and liquor, and the prevention of fortifications and military training of the natives." They were responsible to the Mandates Commission.

The Class B Mandates have now all been transferred to the Trusteeship System of the United Nations. They are: British Togoland, the British Cameroons and Tanganyika, all being administered by Great Britain; the French Togoland and the French Cameroons, being administered by France, and Ruanda-Urundi, being administered by Belgium. These, together with other trusteeships in the South Pacific, administered by Aus-

tralia, New Zealand and the United States, include a total population of 15,000,239.

South West Africa, a "Class C" mandate under the League of Nations, was administered by the Union of South Africa, because of geographical contiguity, as an "integral portion" of the Union. This territory has not been put under the trusteeship system of the United Nations. The Union of South Africa petitioned the United Nations General Assembly last year for permission to annex it, but the petition was denied and in both the first and second sessions of the General Assembly the Union of South Africa was requested to place the territory under trusteeship.

THE ITALIAN COLONIES

The question as to the administration of the former Italian colonies in Africa depends on the agreement of the Council of Foreign Ministers, or failing that, United Nations Assembly recommendation — but in any event, it seems almost certain that they will be placed under the trusteeship system, no matter by whom administered.

The aims of the trusteeship system are to further international peace and security; to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories and their progressive development toward self-government; to encourage respect for human rights

and for fundamental freedoms for all, without respect to race, sex or creed and encourage recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world; and to insure equal treatment in social, economic and commercial matters for all members of the U. N. and their nationals without prejudicing the above objectives.

The administration of each territory is governed by a special agreement, particularly fitted to the needs of the area in question. The Trusteeship Council not only examines reports on the administration of these areas, but also reviews petitions and is empowered to make periodic visits.

By far the greater areas with non-self-governing population in Africa have *not* been put under trusteeship, but information about conditions in such territories is transmitted to the U. N. by the administering powers, who have bound themselves to consider the welfare of the inhabitants paramount. Included here are such territories as French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, Nigeria, Kenya, Uganda, the Gold Coast, etc. Gains in the development of the inhabitants have been noted recently, e.g., the granting of full French citizenship to the people of French West Africa. Such gains will undoubtedly increase under the necessity of reporting them to the United Nations.

Among the Specialized Agencies of the U. N., which have displayed special concern for the natives in non-

self-governing territories, is the International Labor Organization, which has passed conventions on labor standards and practices especially applicable to conditions in such areas.

However, Africa does not figure in the United Nations solely as a "dependent" continent.

Besides Egypt, which is generally referred to as a Middle Eastern country, Liberia and Ethiopia as sovereign states are represented among the fifty-seven United Nations. It is interesting and encouraging to note that Mr. A. D. Wilson of Liberia was elected vice-chairman of the Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Committee at the second session of the General Assembly. There are, besides, four Africans in the Secretariat: Mr. Cox of Liberia in the Documents division; Mr. Kalibala of Uganda in the Research and Analysis section of the Trusteeship department; and Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Chapman, both of the Gold Coast, in the division on Africa in the non-self-governing areas section of the Trusteeship department. The responsible judgment and technical knowledge required in these positions is an indication of the contributions which Africans who have had adequate opportunities are prepared to make to the advancement of their own peoples and to international peace and welfare.

The missions, in addition to their primary task of winning souls to a new freedom and progress under

Christ, have done in the past and will in the future do much to better the moral, material and social conditions of Africa toward which the U. N. looks. Both can be assisted greatly by more scholarships for African stu-

dents to Catholic colleges and universities in this country, so that sound leadership not only in the faith but in the growing responsibilities of civic life may be ensured. Progress along this line is expected.



Morals and the Fourth Estate

"A journalist must have above all a sense of moral values. This wins the confidence of the reader more than brilliant epigrammatics and sophistication. The journalist needs a true and coherent philosophy of life not so much in order to satisfy an explicit and conscious demand of the public but rather in order to awaken in the reader such a demand. The journalist, to whom the reader, distracted and obsessed by the worries of every-day life, delegates a large part of his own capacity of criticism, judgment and synthesis, should begin by realizing in his own person the ideal of a coherent and responsible attitude towards life, into which he wishes to initiate his audience.

"This age has lost the taste for abstract ideas. People want useful information, news, amusing details. The ideological newspaper has given way to the newspaper of information. But in this process, very often ideological and doctrinal tendencies have camouflaged themselves in the guise of biased news. This has caused one political leader to say: "Give me control over the news in your paper, and I don't care who writes the editorials."—*From an address delivered by Professor Guido Gonella, Italian Minister of Education, at the opening of the third academic year of the School of Journalism of the Pro Deo Institute of Public Opinion in Rome, Nov. 25, 1947.*

THE EDITORIAL MIND

What's the Joke?

A SCRIPPS-HOWARD writer, Fred W. Perkins, tells in last Sunday's *Pittsburg Press* of tracing down a quotation he found in a CIO publication, ascribed to Charles F. Kettering, an important official of the General Motors Corporation. Cited as being part of a speech delivered by Mr. Kettering on Oct. 23, 1947, to the managing editors of a large number of Associated Press newspapers, the extract read:

"Some of the boys said something tonight about the importance of advertising in selling. I said we never looked at it that way. We always felt that we owed the newspapers something in the form of advertising for the other things they did. We really didn't advertise to sell cars, we had to advertise to keep the newspapers going."

Mr. Perkins, much to his surprise, found that the quotation was accurate; the exact words were printed in a report of the speech published by General Motors. But, he was assured by another GM executive, Mr. Kettering "was just being facetious"; he "loves to needle newspaper people."

But can the deadly precision of Mr. Kettering's "facetious," "needling" remarks be questioned? Isn't it true that the dailies have carried acres of advertising in the past several years that weren't intended to sell a dollar's worth of goods? Hasn't all of this helped to "keep the newspapers going?" And haven't the newspapers responded by being quite friendly to the corporations that provided this help, and quite unfriendly toward the workers who have been annoying GM and other "big business" outfits with demands for better wages, etc.?"—THE PITTSBURGH CATHOLIC, *Pittsburgh, Pa.*, Jan. 22, 1948.

Sound Business Sense

SIXTY years is a long time to take in perceiving the obvious. In the December, 1947 issue of the *Ecclesiastical Review* Bishop Francis J. Haas of Grand Rapids, Mich., enunciates three principles of a sound economy which seem obvious once you look at them, but which American business, by and large, has yet to see clearly. They were recognized by social thinkers back in the 1880's, he says; and here we are in 1948 and they are still

recognized—by social thinkers. The principles are, as we have said, obvious: 1) you can't sell goods to people who haven't money; 2) it's good business to see that people have money to buy your goods; 3) you won't get anywhere by not using your head.

The great American working public is our best market. But there is no use in our production lines turning out cars, refrigerators, radios and what not, unless there is money in the workingman's pocket. That money is his paycheck. Every time the employer underpays his workers, he is making sure that they cannot buy his goods—or other producer's goods for that matter. It would be good business for employers to get together and try to eliminate substandard wages, and thus put some more money in the buying market.

While we are on the subject, we may as well grind an axe of our own. How much prosperity has the South lost (and the North as well) through the fact that thirteen million Negroes live, as a group, under substandard conditions? Here is a huge market going begging; which may be the reason why, in the not far distant past, many a former employer went begging, too. One of the smartest moves American business could make would be to throw its weight behind the movement for a National Fair Employment Practices Commission.

All this, of course, means that business must use its head—or is that

ancient art dying out in the United States? That goes for the unions, too. Management and labor are in the same boat and there is no getting out for either of them. That little-understood phrase, "the common good," means what is good for both employer and worker. They should get together and find out what it is and how to achieve it.—*INTERRACIAL REVIEW, New York, N. Y., January, 1948.*

Ehrenburg Versus History

“WHEN the Paraguayan missions left the hands of the Jesuits in 1768, they had arrived at what is perhaps the highest degree of civilization to which it is possible to lead a young people. . . . Laws were there respected; morals were pure; a happy brotherhood bound men together; the useful arts and even some of the more pleasing sciences flourished; there was abundance everywhere.” A man called Voltaire wrote that.

“In the way the Jesuits conferred the benefits of European civilization upon the natives of Paraguay”—in that way American business men are going to confer the benefits of American civilization upon Europe. From whom does that enlightening comparison come? From Comrade Ehrenburg—according to a Moscow broadcast.

Molotov told Vishinsky, and Vish-

insky told the gang of satellites, and so the word got to Ehrenburg that American plutocrats—the “bandits”—are moving into Europe to plunder and enslave the continent. That was what was done centuries ago to the Indians of Paraguay by the Jesuits—that is what Ehrenburg said to the world by radio.

Some kind soul ought to monitor Ehrenburg. No one can bury his own filth by shovelling dirt on the other fellow, even if there really is some slimy dirt to heave upon the other fellow. Here is the unfortunate Ehrenburg flinging libels upon the Jesuits, while thousands and thousands of Americans are reading the Yale University Press book: *Forced Labor in Soviet Russia*, by Dallin and Nicolaevsky. While millions upon millions are in horrible fact kept in slavery under Russia's Red dictatorship, Ehrenburg belches the foul lies that the Jesuits made slaves of Indians in Paraguay, and that America is bringing that serfdom to Europeans.

Ehrenburg always makes it plain that he is quite satisfied with what he is sure is his cleverness. How a man who cannot call his soul his own can be satisfied with himself is a mystery. It is very, very hard, too, to understand how Ehrenburg could think himself clever in making the Jesuits of the *Reductions of Paraguay* horrible examples. If those Jesuits were criminals—and Ehrenburg charges that they were—their crime

was that they introduced a sort of “communism” among the Indians.

The Jesuit *Reductions of Paraguay*—what were they really in historical fact? They were the successful attempts of Jesuit missionaries to gather nomadic savages into communities of their own so that, protected against the slave traders, and segregated from the vicious example of white men, those primitive tribesmen could have the opportunity to learn and follow a human and civilized and Christian way of life.

What Voltaire wrote about the Jesuit *Reductions of Paraguay* was not rhetoric, but history. His quoted words ought to be effective, because Voltaire, once a student in a Jesuit school, was later no friend of the Catholic Church, nor of the Jesuits.

The politicians, who in 1773 extorted from Pope Clement XIV the suppression of the Society of Jesus, laid the groundwork of their infamous objective in a campaign of calumny against the Jesuits. It has been in the methods of that campaign that evidently Ehrenburg has got some of his training as a propagandist and historian.

One of the calumnies against the Jesuits was that they exploited the Indians of the *Reductions* as “forced laborers” in gold mines, and so had amassed fabulous wealth. After the Jesuits and their Indians were driven from the *Reductions*, there was furious hunting for Jesuit gold. None

has ever been found—there was none to find—any more than any truth is to be found in Ehrenburg in his case against history.—*THE CATHOLIC MIRROR, Springfield, Mass., December, 1947.*

Sex in Advertising

IN ONE of his recent syndicated columns Angelo Patri deplored "sex emphasis in advertising." This widely-read authority on youth problems is especially concerned with the effect on child minds.

He writes; "I see no reason for some of the pictures that illustrate the advertisements. They are on the vulgar side; some of them crass in their sexiness. Some of the advertisements that I have seen for perfume are an affront to a decent woman."

Mr. Patri is discovering late in the day a very nasty little situation which has been obvious for some time. Every advertiser knows, or thinks that he knows, that the picture of a pretty girl is always eye-catching. Some of them know, or think that they know, that if this same pretty girl is posed immodestly, the advertisement compels a second glance.

So those artists who are interested primarily in a quick dollar, no matter how dirty its complexion, mix a dash of sex in their copy. In a way it's an impishly clever trick because the

objector is put in a bad light. He is forced to state that he finds unchaste suggestion in an illustration which the artist regards (so the artist says) as an honest, clean-minded effort to push legitimate merchandise. Nor does it help to know in one's heart that the artist is undoubtedly a deliberate liar.

Mr. Patri is distressed. But he has no solution beyond the pious hope that "the more conservative people in the business modify the extravagances of others."

The columnist admits defeat too readily. Very near at hand is a completely effective, practical remedy—boycott all merchandise which is exploited by sexy advertising. Whether it's automobiles, magazines, cigarettes, perfume, women's apparel, paint-brushes, motion pictures, furniture polish — anything — you can control their advertising by the very simple resort of refusing to buy products which smear undraped women on magazine covers, outside theatre marquees, and over the billboards that dot towns and befoul countrysides.

Carrie Nation, a simple, direct soul who disliked saloons, used to march through the swinging doors and smash bottles. We, the people, have a corrective for sexy advertising far more devastating than Carrie Nation's hatchet anytime we decide to use it.—*THE PILOT, Boston, Mass., Dec. 5, 1947.*

Mr. Blanshard in Medicine

JOSEPH L. MCGOLDRICK, M.D.

Reprinted from THE HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW*

RECENTLY the *Nation* offered its readers a series of articles written with a definite and obvious animus against the Catholic Church. One of the articles, entitled "The Catholic Church in Medicine," was in fact an attack on the right of Catholic doctors and nurses to carry on their profession in accord with the dictates of their conscience. The author disavowed such a purpose, but then proceeded to cast ridicule on the efforts made by the Church to give to Catholic doctors and nurses the *moral* (only that) guidance they need in the problems that confront them.

Of course, the author tried cleverly to mask this attack by directing his venom against the clergy who furnish such guidance. But he is not deceiving anyone who knows how to think. When he denies to the clergy of the Catholic Church a right to teach morality, he is by that fact denying to the members of the Catholic Church the right to be taught. It is just as well that this point be made clear at the outset so that everyone will know what the real issue is.

If one reads the qualifications of Mr. Paul Blanshard, as listed by the editors of the *Nation*, one can easily

Dr. McGoldrick is attending Gynecologist and Obstetrician at King's County, St. Peter's and Holy Family Hospitals, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Attending Gynecologist at Brooklyn Cancer Hospital and Consultant Gynecologist of Brooklyn State Hospital.

see that he enjoys no special competence as an authority either on Catholic moral teaching or on medicine. When any person undertakes to write on a subject that is foreign to both his training and experience, it is not unusual to find him guilty of inaccuracy and even downright misrepresentation. However qualified Mr. Blanshard may be in his own field, he might better leave the discussion of the problems of medicine to those who are competent to speak because of their experience.

As a Catholic, and as a physician with over a quarter of a century spent in studying, practising and teaching obstetrics and gynecology in private, municipal and State hospitals, I feel I would be unduly and culpably remiss if I remained silent in the face of the indictment which Mr. Blan-

* 53 Park Place, New York 7, N. Y., February, 1948

shard has drawn up against the Church and the Catholic members of the medical and nursing professions. For that is exactly what Mr. Blanshard has done. I am limiting myself to a reply to Mr. Blanshard's article, "The Catholic Church in Medicine." This is a subject on which I am qualified to speak. I shall leave to others who are qualified in their fields the task of answering the other charges Mr. Blanshard has made. I offer this reply, not in the hope of ridding Mr. Blanshard of his bias (which is so clearly revealed in his aspersions on the Catholic clergy because of their celibacy and in his obvious attempt to drive a wedge between them and the laity of the Church), but in the belief that the *Nation* would not wish its readers to be deprived of the real truth.¹ Fair and open-minded readers deserve the truth, and I shall endeavor to give it to them on the basis of my long and varied experience.

DOES MR. BLANSHARD WANT CONSCIENCELESS PHYSICIANS?

The article, "The Catholic Church in Medicine," forces us to face the question: is the practice of medicine outside the field of morality? I hold to the view that nothing human is above or beyond moral considerations—that is, considerations of right or wrong, of human responsibility. If

the practice of medicine lies outside the field of morality, what grounds are there for the universal condemnation of the recent experimentation on human beings *by medical men* in the concentration camps of Nazi Germany? By the same token, if the practice of medicine is outside the field of morality, why not the practice of law and jurisprudence? Why not business practice, and why not the running of government? Could one imagine what a country would be like where the rights of innocent people could be so easily brushed aside? Fortunately, the vast majority of people, especially the "little" people, are convinced that morality must enter all walks of life. Medicine is no exception. People do not desire to have conscienceless physicians, any more than they want conscienceless rulers or ruthless employers.

This being granted, where do individuals receive their moral education and guidance? Everyone receives it in the same way—from others. We all have some source that we go to because we regard it as qualified. As a rule, that source is some organized group, and it imparts its message in an organized manner. Some readers of the *Nation* may take their moral ideas, of what is right and what is wrong, in many questions from the pages of that journal. I as a Catholic and my fellow-Catholics take our moral guidance from the Catholic Church, in which on any

¹ The Editors of the *Nation* refused to print this article.

question of religion or morality, and only that, we have complete confidence. We do this freely, and we vehemently contest the attempt of anyone to prevent us from doing so.

Above all, we will not be deterred by the implied threats of Mr. Blanshard and of the editors of the *Nation* as to what is in store for us if we continue to follow the spiritual guides we have freely chosen. That is our right under the Constitution of the United States. We are confident that the vast majority of our fellow-citizens are agreed that we should have the selfsame right as they enjoy. They have no desire to relegate Catholics to some kind of second-class citizenship. A Catholic doctor and a Catholic nurse have the same right as that of any other doctor and nurse to form their conscience as they see fit and not to act contrary to it. Mr. Blanshard has no right to hold us up to ridicule, or to attempt to destroy public confidence either in our competence or in our integrity, simply because we are using this right.

Only a biased and completely misinformed critic could be led to suggest that Catholic doctors are taking their medical information from any Catholic journal or any Catholic priest, or that these are presuming to offer such information. Every question that has been treated in any Catholic publication with a bearing on medical matters has been considered purely from a moral point of

view. There is never any attempt to teach any kind of medical technique, for removing gall bladders (as Mr. Blanshard would have his readers infer) or anything else. The question always is: is the course of action morally correct?

Catholic doctors are not taking their medical knowledge from any other source different from that of their non-Catholic associates in the medical profession. It is gross misrepresentation to suggest that they are. If they have moral scruples about certain practices, they are not because of that less proficient in their profession. Many, very many, of our non-Catholic associates share our moral convictions. All of us are confident that our medical competence has not suffered in the least. If anything, because we do not look for the easy way out of a difficulty, we have been stimulated to seek the latest and the best methods and techniques that medical skill has discovered. Our patients have been the beneficiaries. Now for the bugaboo of Mr. Blanshard's article—medical dogmas (sic).

"DOGMA" OF THE EQUALITY OF MOTHER AND FETUS

Mr. Blanshard states:

When an American woman, and I add any woman, American or not, for nationality has nothing to do with it, approaches the ordeal of childbirth, she takes it for granted that her physician will do everything possible to save her life. She is entitled to the best care the

medical profession can give. Anything less than the best is not good enough. Therefore, if her obstetrician imagines that he is confronted with the so-called mother-or-child dilemma, let him call in a doctor of more training and experience, who will be better prepared to do the "humanly possible" and to save both the mother and her child (which is what every mother and father wants).

The mother-or-child dilemma is a relic of the early days of obstetrics. If it is talked about today by any medical men, it is only by those whose training and experience evidently do not qualify them to perform modern obstetrics. In one of the largest hospitals in New York City, where the average number of deliveries is over 3,000 a year, no such dilemma has been encountered in my experience during the last twenty years. I have had the same experience in the private hospitals I attend.

Cases of pregnancy with heart, lung or kidney complications, which were formerly regarded as necessitating therapeutic abortion (a nice-sounding name for an ugly thing), are now carried through to term, or at least to viability, and in most cases result in an improved physical condition of the mother. All this is achieved by the splendid cooperation of the medical consultants. A recent survey (covering the past eighteen months) of one of the large hospitals in New York City, for which Protestant, Jewish and Catholic doctors share the responsibility, reveals that only two

therapeutic abortions were performed in 5,328 deliveries. It is quite apparent that the Protestant and Jewish doctors in this hospital also regard therapeutic abortion as completely outmoded. Medicine, not religion, is the reason. I might add that the two reported abortions were done because of the presence of tuberculosis in one case and of cancer in the other. Medically, it would have been better to treat each condition directly rather than to subject the two patients to added and unnecessary manipulation.

S. A. Cosgrove, M.D., and P. A. Carter, M.D., in a review of 67,000 deliveries reported an incidence of one therapeutic abortion to every 16,750 deliveries (*Amer. Journal Obst. & Gyn.*, XLVIII, p. 305) over a period of twelve years (1931-1943). In reference to rheumatic heart conditions, they declared: ". . . we are justified in our experience in concluding that, if the medical control and treatment are adequate, the pregnancy may be virtually ignored except as emphasizing the stringency of medical control necessary." The cases subjected to therapeutic abortion by Dr. Cosgrove were those of hypertension and hyperemesis. In the latter (one case) he admits it could be questioned, and in the former (3 cases), in my experience, intensive and prolonged medical treatment have given results equal to those obtained in his series without subjecting the patient to the additional direct danger of the abor-

tion. In these three cases there was no improvement in the medical status for which the abortion was done.

Years ago doctors, whose motives were certainly above reproach but whose training and knowledge were in no way comparable to the standards that prevail today, gave an astounding list of indications for abortions. With the advance of medical competence many of these pseudo-indications have been deleted from the list. One of the leading gynecologists of today has reduced them to four. I have no doubt that, with further progress in medical science and with continued recognition of the imperativeness of sound ethical thinking in the matter, all doctors will abandon the direct murder of the unborn infant as a therapeutic measure. They will come to see that the doctors, both Catholic and non-Catholic, who made it a principle to live up faithfully to their Hippocratic Oath to preserve human life and not destroy it, were not only right in their ethics but also in their medicine.

A doctor should always endeavor to save the life of both the mother and child. He has no right, under God's heaven, to kill the mother to save the child or to kill the child to save the mother. No law of God gives that right. No doctor should pretend that it does. Members of the medical profession and their medical societies are striving constantly to expose and to weed out from their midst

the practitioners of abortion. This objective will never be realized until the reputable doctor renounces, once and for all, the power to kill and relies solely on the rightful techniques made available to him by modern medical science. It is not within the purview of his Hippocratic Oath that a doctor should disregard ethical principles and resort to murder in order to accomplish good. I am sure that Mr. Blanshard would agree that "a good end never justifies a morally bad means" is a sound ethical principle.

"DOGMA" OF THE SACRED HEAD

This theory is as ridiculous as it is fantastic. Indeed, it would be ludicrous if it were not so sad that an educated man, like Mr. Blanshard, could write such nonsense. The Catholic boy or girl in elementary Catholic schools knows that the soul is not confined to any specific anatomic region, because of its spiritual nature. Injury to the head of the unborn living child (as in craniotomy) is condemned, not because it is an attack on the head, but because it is premeditated and direct killing. Like direct abortion, it is a deliberate, unprovoked attack on the life of an innocent human being. In plain words, it is murder, as Dr. Samuel Cosgrove has well said: "(murder) may in some cases be adequately defined as the premeditated killing of a human being with wanton disregard of the rights of the victim. So defined, I consider my use of the

word, 'murder,' to designate the destruction of a fetus to be entirely justified" (*Amer. Jour. Obst. & Gyn.*, XLVIII, p. 896).

I will not waste any time on explaining why nurses are told *how* to baptize a fetus in imminent danger of death. That is purely and simply a religious rite, the details of which should not be a cause of concern for Mr. Blanshard or any reader of the *Nation*. If the Catholic Church urges Catholic nurses to baptize an infant in danger of death, she does so in no proselytizing spirit. The proof of that fact lies in the efforts made to have non-Catholic doctors and nurses, both Protestant and Jewish, baptize in similar circumstances. There is many a non-Catholic physician who boasts of the baptisms he has performed in cases of emergency. Evidently proselytism has nothing to do with the matter. It is too bad Mr. Blanshard did not consult people as well as books before he wrote his article. Then he would have gotten the whole truth.

"DOGMA" OF PROSELYTISM

According to Mr. Blanshard, "Catholic nurses are instructed not to accord Protestant or Jewish clergymen equal treatment with Catholic priests, even when the hospital is a non-Catholic institution and the patient is a Protestant or Jew." This is a complete misrepresentation, which is due either to dishonesty or to un-

mitigated anti-Catholic bigotry. Here is the reason I make that charge.

The very passage from Charles McFadden's "Medical Ethics for Nurses," which Mr. Blanshard quoted, is followed by these words, which no man of integrity would have failed to include in his quotation:

The difficulties, however, are easily solved. When the non-Catholic makes a request for a minister of his religion, the Catholic nurse may tactfully request him to have a member of his family, a friend, or a nurse of his own religious belief, attend to the matter for him.

When a non-Catholic minister is visiting his patient, the Catholic nurse in a spirit of courtesy may bring him any materials he may desire. She must always avoid actual participation in any non-Catholic religious ceremony (pp. 333-334).

Therefore, when Mr. Blanshard wrote that Catholic nurses were instructed to discriminate against Protestant and Jewish clergymen, he knew that was not so. I leave it to the readers of the *Nation* to decide how that type of conduct is to be regarded.

The Catholic nurse in a Catholic or a non-Catholic hospital is always courteous and respectful towards any minister of religion or any religious ceremony, notwithstanding her own views on religion. There is never, in any Catholic hospital, a prohibition against summoning a non-Catholic clergyman. In non-sectarian hospitals, Catholic and non-Catholic nurses have no difficulty in dealing with the

clergymen who minister to the patients of their denominations. The problem that Mr. Blanshard discovered is no problem at all, certainly as far as we Catholic doctors and nurses are concerned. All that the Church asks us is to have the right idea and motive when we see to it that our non-Catholic patients have the consolation of their religion.

"DOGMA" OF ECTOPIC PREGNANCY

The question of ectopic gestation or tubal pregnancy is presented as Mr. Blanshard's final and crushing indictment. Actually the blow is far from fatal. Mr. Blanshard does not seem to realize that ectopic pregnancy is a rarity. It is down in the neighborhood of one per cent, according to available statistics. That Catholic moralists discuss the case is only proof that it occasionally happens. Secondly, he is completely wrong when he states: "... if allowed to continue its natural growth (the ectopic fetus), is likely to kill both the mother and itself" (p. 468). What usually happens is that nature itself terminates the pregnancy in its very first weeks. The doctor and mother discover the situation only after it is over. The only question then is the welfare of the mother. But, occasionally, it does happen that an ectopic pregnancy is discovered before rupture. It is this very rare case which Mr. Blanshard makes the *cause célèbre* of all medical ethics.

The medical attitude towards ectopic gestation illustrates the progress medicine has made in recent years. Textbooks of thirty or forty years ago displayed a meagre knowledge of the etiology and pathology of tubal pregnancy as compared with our present-day understanding of this problem. With our increased knowledge of the pathology of this condition, as with the advance made in the other branches of medical science, our ideas and methods of treatment have changed greatly. Our methods of interpretation have not changed, and our reasoning processes are still conditioned by the same rules. But naturally, when doctors arrive at new facts, new corollaries follow. The churchmen do not establish medical facts. They can only give their moral pronouncements on the facts the doctors present to them. Could it be otherwise?

When competent medical men discovered, as a medical fact, that tubal pregnancy by its pathological nature was not merely a future danger but an immediate and present danger to the life of the mother, Catholic moralists began to affirm that treatment of this pathological condition aimed at, and solely for the purpose of, saving the mother's life could not be certainly censored, even though the death of the fetus might ensue incidentally. Real sickness or pathology may always be treated. If in this situation the churchmen have applied their principles to a new set of facts, it is

because of the changed medical data presented to them by us doctors. If there had been mistakes, it would have been because of misinformation from doctors, not because the churchmen were clerics or celibates.

For Mr. Blanshard's information, I might add that the change in viewpoint was not delayed until 1945. I have had in my possession for many years an article written in the *Catholic Medical Guardian* (Vol. IV, No. 2, April, 1926, published by Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd., London), in which the legitimacy of the present-day treatment of ectopic pregnancy is defended.² It was only shortly before that that the medical men began to regard this condition as pathological. Mr. Blanshard did not make a careful study of his subject. If he did, he kept some of his knowledge to himself and did not share it with the readers of the *Nation*.

Mr. Blanshard asks: "How many Catholic women died between 1902 and 1945?" It is hard to estimate the number of women, Catholic or

non-Catholic, who died between the years 1902 to 1945 because of tubal pregnancy, whether diagnosed correctly or incorrectly by Catholic or non-Catholic doctors. Serious pathological conditions are not cognizant of the doctor in attendance. Tubal pregnancy, ruptured or not, is one of the most difficult conditions to diagnose. No doctor should be censured because he failed to meet the situation in the rare instances in which it occurs.

No doubt many women have died in the past, and too many die today, we regret to admit, in spite of our better training, increased knowledge, greater facilities, up-to-date equipment and pre-natal care. But those who die, die regardless of the religion of the doctor. The only factor is his medical skill, or at least his own recognition of his limitations. Many circumstances contribute to our maternal death rate; being right in principle is never one. But being wrong in fact is a contribution of no little significance.

² Many other articles appeared on the subject and were accepted and taught in the schools between 1905 and 1945. Cfr. "Ethics of Ectopic Pregnancy", by Frederick W. Rice, M.D., in *Homiletic*, August, 1935.



Take Your Choice

"In view of the economic evolution in the world today and the general penury in which it finds itself, absolute individual liberty is a snare and a danger. Either industry will discipline itself or its authority will be taken over by the tyranny of the State."—*Statement of the 8th Convention of the International Federation of Catholic Employer Associations, Paris, May 17-18, 1947.*

Report on China

MOST REV. PAUL YU-PIN, D.D.
Archbishop of Nanking, China

An address delivered before the Institute of Chinese Culture, Washington, D. C., Nov. 12, 1947.

TODAY, China is fighting, not a civil war, but a life and death struggle against Soviet communism—the new invader of China. True, the fighting in China has the appearance of a civil war. Let us not be deceived. It is part, the beginning, of an international war, a world war, launched by the Soviet Union against the democracies.

The third world war has already begun. The armed skirmishes of this new war started before the old war was finished. In Europe, the third world war started with the so-called civil war in Greece. There, an armed Greek Communist army, assisted by international brigades from the surrounding Soviet-dominated countries, revolted and attempted to overthrow by force the Greek Government.

In Asia, the third world war started in China. It began when the Chinese Communist armies, sheltered, equipped and in part officered by the Russian Army, attempted to establish independent sovereignty in Manchuria. These armies met in battle with the armies of the Chinese Government.

There were no Chinese Commu-

nist troops in Manchuria on VJ-day (surrender of Japan). The Soviet plan was to use the time gained by the armistice to transfer as many Communist troops as possible from North China to Manchuria and there to arm them with the abundant Japanese supplies and equipment which the Russian Army had seized when the Japanese Army surrendered. To withdraw the Russian Red Army from Manchuria only when it could be replaced by a well-armed Chinese Red Army, and use the Marshall truce period for this purpose: this was the Soviet plan. It worked perfectly. Today the Communist forces occupy ninety per cent of Manchuria.

The fighting in China today is a war between Soviet communism (using her satellites, the armed Chinese Communists) and the democratic forces of the world, with which China has, by choice, taken her place, and for which cause she is now fighting. The whole truth is that China, today, is fighting for the democracies—as in World War I and II. It is but a half truth to call it a civil war. Chinese communism, like communism in every country, is but a part of the

international Communist movement.

International communism obeys and is led in all its activities from its supreme headquarters within the Soviet Union.

In the war in China, the Communist forces have fighting for them, not only Chinese Communist troops, but also Korean troops, Mongolian soldiers, Japanese troops and Russian officers. These international brigades comprise one-third of the Communist force in Manchuria. Some officers of the Russian Army direct military operations. Russia supplies much of the war materials used by the Chinese Communists; most of the guns, ammunition and artillery used were surrendered to Russia by Japan; some of the supplies are part of American and British lend-lease to Russia.

These events I have been citing—so-called Greek civil war and the so-called Chinese civil war—are not part of the Second World War. True, great wars have as their aftermaths civil war, revolutions and mass strikes. But these two events, the war in Greece and the war in China, are of a different character. The forces basically opposed in them, opposed and clashing by arms, as well as by economic and political competition, are not aligned as were the opposing forces of the Second World War.

One of the main power groupings of that war has indeed been eliminated—Germany and her nazism. The main power grouping, in this

third world war, is Russia and her Communist satellites on the one side and the democratic forces of the world on the other. China is fighting the opening battle of the third world war for the democracies.

Is there any hope for world peace? After these years of death and suffering, of exile and destruction, there is a great weariness in the world. It is hard to say it, but hope without action is empty. The penalty for closing our eyes to facts will be heavy; the price of inaction will be catastrophe. To be forewarned is to be forearmed.

Also it is true that preliminary skirmishes, even bloody skirmishes, are not identical with the grand battle and the further widespread, advanced stages of a full world war. Sometimes the grand battle can be delayed, and even avoided. It is possible that the third world war may never advance much beyond these preliminary stages. If the democracies join together and assist each other for the common cause, and put up a united, strong front against the new aggressor, Soviet communism will fail in her objective—world conquest.

CHINESE GOVERNMENT

During my last visit to the States I was happy to hear and feel the praise and warmth of friendship that swept the country. On this present trip, since I arrived here, I observed a change of attitude toward China.

Before, there was admiration and praise for China's heroic fight against the Japanese invader. Now there is criticism and disappointment because of our courage and determination to fight the new invader. If fighting against aggression and invasion in 1941 was a great virtue, how can it now in 1947 be a vice? Whilst we did not deserve all the flowery praises you showered upon us at the time of Pearl Harbor, yet neither do we deserve the unqualified criticism and scoldings which too many American writers, broadcasters and some Government officials are giving us today. Specifically, the Chinese Government is accused of being undemocratic, Fascist, non-liberal.

What means Fascist and non-liberal? These words are confusing. What they mean here in the United States, I do not know. But, as used by the Communists in China, all who oppose communism are labeled Fascists and non-liberals.

Is the Chinese Government democratic? In a very true sense I can bear testimony to the fact that it is democratic. However, it does not enjoy all the luxuries of democracy yet. No country does during war. Let me explain.

Some 19 years ago (only yesterday in the perspective of history) the present Government of the Republic of China was established. Only one-score years ago China was a loosely knit country of semi-independent

states (provinces) under the rule of war lords. Today the authority of the Central Government is firmly established except in Communist areas. This is progress; and, incidentally, the reason why we could fight the war so long and victoriously against the might of Japan.

China has already passed through the three stages on the road to a constitutional government: the military period, the period of tutelage (or educational stage) and is now at the door of the constitutional stage. The first two periods are over, and now the era of constitutional government becomes effective, Christmas of this year. Since April of this year, there has been ruling China, an interim, multi-party government. It is a liberal government, because it includes all the political parties of China (except the Communist Party, which was invited, but refused to come in).

Now the highest policy-making body of this coalition government of China is the state council. This coalition council of state is, by law, made up of forty members. Here is the break-down: the much-belabored Kuomintang Party, under Chiang Kai-shek, has seventeen members. The Young China Party has four members. The Democratic Socialists have four members. The Independents have four members. The Communists were allotted eight members; their front parties given three members. Hence out of forty seats, the Kuo-

mingtang Party has only seventeen members—far less than a majority.

Now the executive arm of the Chinese Government is run by a coalition cabinet made up of twenty-four heads of the various government ministries and commissions. The present political representation in this coalition cabinet is as follows: Kuomintang fourteen; Democratic Socialists three; Young China three; Independents four. No more one-party rule in China.

Is the Chinese Government democratic? If by democracy you mean Soviet democracy—then we have not got it. Soviet democracy is slavery. If by democracy you mean certain types of democracy that came out of Europe in the past century, that too we have not. For the engineers and philosophy of that democracy were Godless men with no respect for the dignity and rights of all men of all classes. But if by democracy you mean American democracy, which has as its basis and philosophy the American Constitution, and in its interpretation Lincoln's "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," and in its application to others, John Hay's open-door policy in China (defending the integrity of China)—this kind of democracy we have in China in principle, in law and in government.

Our new constitution is practically a copy of your American Constitution; the children in the schools of

China know the American Constitution almost by heart. The set-up of our government is much the same as yours; its administration is in the hands of a multi-party government. We have freedom of speech, religion and assembly in China. As I said before, some of the luxuries of democracy we do not yet enjoy, and that because of the necessities of war. For instance, the new general mobilization order, which was issued and signed by the new coalition government, curtails some rights in the interests of national security, for the purpose of mobilizing the nation to fight the new invader and aggressor of China—Soviet communism.

CHINA HINDERED BY INFLATION

The people of China live in a glass house. There are no curtains on the windows of China, much less iron curtains. Within that glass house of China 400,000,000 people, one-fifth of the human family, labors and strives and struggles to make a scant living—with not enough food in the pantry. Everything they do can be seen by the world—nothing is hidden. The correspondents of the world are free to come to China and look in each of the 10,000 windows of the house of China. (In Manchuria Soviet communism has drawn a heavy iron curtain—your newspapermen cannot go there.) If these newspapermen report to you what they have seen, even though it is bad, we are not displeased

—that is democracy—for the press can be a powerful deterrent against evil. The truth is that a large section of the American press has criticized China unfairly, indulged in exaggerations, half-truths and falsehoods.

Runaway inflation in China is the cause of most of the deplorable conditions there. For inflation brings on high prices, which in turn creates black markets. Inflation, cutting down the buying power of salary, brings about a low standard of living. Government servants, military and civil, must look elsewhere for enough money to support their families. This is bad. It drives good men out of the Government. It creates inefficiency and corruption.

All this is true. I wish to state the facts. But I also want to place them in their proper perspective and causes. I am free to speak out. I am a private citizen, not a government official. In China, my six daily newspapers and two broadcasting stations have waged a crusade against these evils of inefficiency corruption and graft. I criticize the Government, but constructively, by hammering at the causes of these evils. And the main cause of these evils in China today is Soviet communism. By their invasion, they necessitate a huge standing army and huge war-costs—which is the main cause of inflation. They have robbed Manchuria of her heavy industry (\$2,000,000,000 worth), which was brought back to Russia. They have

deprived China of eighty per cent of her raw materials. They have destroyed large sections of rail-transportation in China and sabotaged every effort of the government to improve China's economy. Conditions in China, political, economic and social cannot be improved until the Communist invader is driven from our lands.

You might well say: Why does not the Chinese Government tell the world about Soviet Russia's invasion of China? Officially, she cannot. Yalta forced China into a 30-year alliance of friendship with Russia. This treaty of friendship is officially still in force.

Why does not the Chinese Government, at least, nail and blast the lies about China in the American press? I will permit a great friend of China to answer that one. I quote Clare Boothe Luce:

China * * * is the greatest country in the world in terms of what counts most—individual human souls. China, the oldest civilization in the world—and China, the first and longest-suffering of all the United Nations—China—a country too civilized to be 100 percent militaristic, too isolated to be industrialized, too polite to master the vulgarities of propaganda, too patient to know how to complain against her allies. And because the Chinese are too polite and they are too civilized, too proud and too loyal to their allies to give their side of the story in the vulgate called by our so-called civilized nations propaganda * * * therefore, you and I must tell it.

Today in this world, the church is

suffering a great persecution at the hands of Soviet communism and her satellites. Greater than the old Roman persecution against the early Christians. Today there are more martyrs for the faith than in the days of early Christianity. The same is true in China. That is, it is true in that part of China occupied by the Soviet Communists — North China and Inner Mongolia.

ATTEMPT TO ANNIHILATE THE CHURCH

During the Japanese war, the Communist Party line in China was to appear tolerant toward the church—to win them over. However, after the war, particularly beginning this year, the Communists started an open persecution of the church. The Communists now know that they cannot deceive or win over the church to their cause. Hence their policy now is to annihilate the church. This terrible policy they are methodically carrying out in Mongolia (Inner). Here are some case histories.

Some months ago, in Inner Mongolia, in the Province of Chahar, in the city of Chungli, the Communist troops overran this little Christian village of 3,000 people and slaughtered half the population. Church buildings were destroyed. Inhuman cruelty was perpetrated on this Christian community.

Sungshu Twei Tsi is a town of the Province of Jehol in Inner Mongolia. This is a Christian community of

2,000 people. Communist troops invaded the town. They murdered hundreds of Christian inhabitants.

Recently the famous Trappist Monastery in Yung Kai Ping, Chahar Province, Inner Mongolia, was overrun by the Communist troops. Eighty Chinese Trappist monks—noble men who never harmed their fellowmen—were captured and taken away as prisoners. The monastery was burned to the ground. What happened to the monks? Most probably, they were forced into being carriers for the Red army—perhaps they were put to death.

A Polish bishop in North China, together with twelve priests and sisters, was beaten by the Communists. Somehow they escaped. Afterwards the Communists burned the bishop in effigy before his own church. The Christians there suffered great persecution from the Communists.

Ninety per cent of Manchuria is occupied by the Communists. Missions there, both Catholic and Protestant, are suffering at the hands of the Communists. Many missionaries are leaving Manchuria because of this persecution. It is difficult to tell just what is happening there, because the Communists have drawn an iron curtain across Manchuria.

The refugee missionaries seek refuge in the Province of Hopei. Hopei is the most Catholic Province in China 800,000 in number, one-fifth of the Catholics in China. The great Cardinal T'ien is the metropolitan, with

his episcopal seat located at Peking.

I here pay tribute to the Christian courage and heroism of our suffering and persecuted Christians in north China and Manchuria. They are fighting the good fight. We are proud of them.

CHURCH IN CENTRAL AND SOUTH CHINA

Central and South China is free of the Communists. There the central

government of China is in control. Christian rehabilitation is not handicapped. There the church is progressing tremendously. There the church is cooperating with the Government in spiritual and moral reconstruction, specifically in reopening high schools, colleges and universities, and in opening new ones. The demand for Christian teachers and educators is far in excess of our humble resources.



Science and Wisdom

"The atomic era is the crowning achievement of the 'age of enlightenment.' Yet we had to wait for the 'age of enlightenment' to get the blackout, and the infernal night of Hiroshima. Without wisdom, the light of science leads to night. For wisdom

is the brightness of eternal life, and the unspotted mirror of God's majesty, and the image of his goodness. . . . For she is more beautiful than the sun, and above all the order of the stars: being compared with the light, she is found before it. *For after this cometh night*, but no evil can overcome wisdom (Wis. 7, 26; 29, 30).

Modern man has been led to give himself completely to science and technological art because they put him in control of the forces of nature and place unlimited power in his hands. He must now admit the evidence that physical force can be a deadly enemy as well as a helpful friend. But the modern mind still fails to understand that only wisdom and prudence can keep the friend from turning into an enemy."—Bernard I. Mullahy, C.S.C. in ORATE FRATRES, December 28, 1947.

Papal Concordats

THOMAS F. DOYLE

*Reprinted from the MARIANIST**

AN OUTSTANDING event this year was the incorporation of the 1929 Vatican-Italy concordat in the new Italian constitution. In Germany, meanwhile, Allied authorities were reported to have agreed that relations with the Catholic Church should be governed according to the concordat made between Pope Pius XI and the Third Reich in 1933, only to be nullified by subsequent Nazi persecution of the Church.

These developments have stirred new interest in concordats generally. Since concordats have played an important part in the Church's history over a period of centuries, Catholics should have some understanding of their nature and purpose. Such information will help them to appreciate the constant role the Vatican has played in maintaining and defending the Church's rights in various countries. It should sharpen interest in the current problems of the Church in Poland, where Catholic leaders are hopeful that the Russian-dominated government may reinstate the 1925 concordat between the former Polish state and the Holy See. This agreement was abrogated by Warsaw in

1945 on the specious pretext that the Vatican had adopted a pro-German, anti-Polish attitude following Hitler's overthrow.

Concordat is the name commonly given to treaties or agreements between the Catholic Church and civil governments. These agreements are concerned solely with religious or church matters. Their purpose generally is to end dissension between the Church and the civil powers, although sometimes concordats have been signed with countries in which no actual Church-State disagreements existed, merely to forestall possible discord in the future or to improve the condition of the Church. Such was the case when a concordat was signed in 1862 by Pope Pius IX and President Garcia Morena of Ecuador.

A common misconception among non-Catholics is that when the Church enters into a concordat with a state, it automatically endorses the form of government prevailing there. Critics have charged that Pius XI, by approving concordats with Germany and Italy at a time when both countries were under dictatorship rule, inferentially, at least, gave his blessing to Nazism and Fascism. Actually, the

* 106 Franklin St., Dayton 2, Ohio, October, 1947

Pope acted solely to preserve the interest of religion and to uphold the freedom and rights of the Church in the two countries. This was made abundantly clear when, in later years, the Pontiff issued two strongly-worded encyclicals denouncing both Nazism and Fascism. It would be just as logical to accuse the Holy See of pro-Fascism because Vatican diplomats are prepared to revive the Polish concordats, under proper conditions, even though this means entering into arrangements with a Russian-controlled government.

As a temporal power, the Vatican is a midget among giants. Its area is only about one-fourth of a square mile. However, as the seat of government of the Catholic Church, it exercises a sovereignty that embraces the whole world. This has meant that, when expedient, the Holy See must enter into some form of agreement with secular states for the definition and protection of ecclesiastical rights. During the first three centuries, when the civil power was bent on the destruction of the Christian Faith, the establishment of concordats was manifestly impossible. On the other hand, such agreements were unnecessary in succeeding centuries when the Christian emperors generally upheld and protected the Church's spiritual sovereignty. From the twelfth century, however, concordats have been established to end or prevent encroachments of the secular powers on

the spiritual prerogatives of the Church, or to secure and guarantee full freedom for the Church as a spiritual institution superior to any earthly organization or power.

THE WORMS AGREEMENT

To date, the Holy See has entered into about 138 concordats with various countries. The earliest concordats were two signed in the twelfth century to end the long dispute with European rulers over the question of lay investiture. The first was established in 1107 with Henry I of England, largely through the efforts of St. Anselm of Canterbury. The second—the famous Concordat of Worms—was made in 1122 between Pope Callistus II and Emperor Henry V of Germany. By far the more significant, the Concordat of Worms brought final victory to the Church in the recurrent struggles of the Papacy to vindicate its absolute religious authority at a time when simony was widespread, and many of the clergy tended to side with kings and princes in their quarrels with the Pope.

The chief effect of the Worms agreement was to check the increasing interference of secular rulers in church affairs. From about the tenth century, it had become the custom, when bishops were appointed, for lay rulers to bestow the ring and staff as emblems of their office. The practice of lay investiture, and other abuses, were strongly opposed, how-

ever, by Pope Gregory VII, one of the greatest of the Roman Pontiffs. Upon his accession in 1073, Gregory deposed all those who had received their investiture at the hands of a layman, and decreed that any layman who dared to confer a spiritual office was to be excommunicated. This action led to the historic struggle between Pope Gregory and Emperor Henry IV of Germany, which persisted into the reign of Henry V, and finally resulted in the German monarch signing the concordat of Worms with Callistus II. Under this agreement, the emperor renounced the right of spiritual investiture and received instead the right of lay investiture with the sceptre, a sign of temporal but not of spiritual authority.

Ranking among the most important concordats of modern times are the French concordat of 1801 between Napoleon I and Pope Pius VII, which re-established the Catholic religion in France after the Revolution and remained in force until 1905, when it was abrogated by a law separating Church and State; the Lateran Treaty with Italy which gave formal recognition to the Pope's status as temporal sovereign and created Vatican City as a civil state; and the 1933 agreement between Pius XI and the Hitler government which was intended to protect the rights of Catholics menaced by the spread of totalitarianism. Other concordats of recent years approved by Pius XI are, besides the

Polish pact, those signed with Latvia, France (for Syria), Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Portugal (for the East Indies), Rumania, Austria, Yugoslavia (not ratified), and Ecuador. All these concordats were signed between 1922 and 1937. Concordats were also signed with Bavaria, Prussia and Baden, but these were superseded by the German agreement of 1933.

BISHOPS AND CONCORDATS

At one time, bishops had the power of making concordats. In the 13th century, the bishops of Norway made a concordat with King Magnus V, while some eighteen treaties were said to have been made between the 13th and 14th centuries by the kings of Portugal and the bishops of the kingdom. However, under the new Canon Law, the power of making concordats is reserved to the Pope alone. Reasons for this are (1) concordats are not necessarily concerned with isolated matters, but may have to do with the settlement of all ecclesiastical matters in a particular country, and (2) in recent concordats concessions to the secular powers have almost always had to be made, contrary to ordinary Canon Law, and such concessions can only be made by the Pope. Concordats are signed by plenipotentiaries: the Cardinal Secretary of State acts for the Holy See, and Ministers of State or ambassadors for the secular power. They become effective as soon

as they are ratified by the Pope and the ruler or parliament of the country involved.

Although concordats are treaties concerned solely with religion, they may involve temporal and "mixed" as well as spiritual matters. Examples of spiritual matters are the insertion of names of rulers in the Canon of the Mass and in the singing of the Divine Office; and arrangements regarding the nomination of bishops, the erection of dioceses and chapters, and the establishment of seminaries and ecclesiastical courts. The practice of praying for rulers is traditional in the Church, and does not involve approbation of governments or of political parties.

Temporal matters are such as of their nature do not belong to the spiritual order. In some concordats, the Church has permitted rulers to tax both ecclesiastical property and the possessions of clerics. In other instances, as in the case of Bohemia, where church possessions were alienated as a result of heretical outbreaks in the 17th century against which Emperor Ferdinand II waged a vigorous campaign, the Pope has relinquished his claims in regard to properties damaged or destroyed in the course of civil or religious disturbances. Comparatively modern examples of the first provisions are to be found in the concordats signed with Costa Rica in 1852 and Salvador in 1862, while both provisions are in-

corporated in the agreement made with Colombia in 1887. It is to be noted, incidentally, that when the Pope sanctions the taxation of church property, he does not acknowledge in the state any inherent right to impose taxes of this kind, but rather implies the opposite by making a concession to the state.

Under the heading of "mixed" matters are those which, in one way or another, belong both to the temporal and spiritual orders, and are subject to both jurisdictions. The most common of these matters refer to public education and marriage. Under the Lateran Treaty, religious instruction was made compulsory in the public elementary and secondary schools, under the direction and control of the clergy. Marriage was recognized as a sacrament by the state and divorce implicitly forbidden.

Some idea of the scope of matters that might be involved in a concordat can be gleaned from the agreement made with Salvador, which is similar to other concordats set up between the Vatican and several Central-American countries in the 19th century.

In the Salvador concordat, Catholicism was defined as the state religion, with freedom of worship permitted to other cults. Education was placed under the supervision of the hierarchy, and the right of bishops to censor books was recognized. The concordat guaranteed to the clergy and laity

unrestricted communication with the Pope. The State undertook to defray the expenses of worship and recognized the Pope's right to erect new dioceses, and the bishops' right to establish new parishes and to introduce religious orders and communities. Furthermore, the State recognized the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts in spiritual matters. It guaranteed the Church the right to acquire and possess property, and forbade the confiscation of such property or the arbitrary union or suppression of benefices by the State.

In turn, the Holy See, besides ceding to the State the right to tax church property, permitted prayers for the Republic to be inserted in the Church's liturgy, and granted the president the right of patronage, of nominating to bishoprics, and of appointing to a certain number of canonries.

The privilege of naming bishops is one of the concessions found in many old concordats with European rulers. Some outstanding examples are the Concordat of Vienna made between Pope Nicholas V and Frederick III in 1448, which climaxed lengthy discussions on ecclesiastical benefices in Germany; the agreement between Pope Leo X and Francis I of France in 1516; and the Concordat of Sardinia approved in 1727 by Pope Benedict XIII and King Victor Amadeus II.

The concordat with Francis I was

of critical importance to the Church. In 1438, King Charles VII of France—the same monarch whose coronation was witnessed by St. Joan of Arc—had issued a law which interfered with Papal rights not only in regard to episcopal nominations, but in important matters of church discipline and authority. Known as the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, the law was prompted by certain decrees of the Council of Basle (1431) which had not been approved by the Holy See. Under this law, the State claimed it had the right to pass upon all decrees and acts of the Vatican before they were promulgated in France. The conflicting claims of the Vatican and the French monarchy naturally led to much confusion. By finally establishing a concordat with King Francis, Pope Leo brought about the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, in return for which he gave the king the right of presenting candidates for bishoprics and abbacies, subject to Papal confirmation.

MODERN STIPULATIONS

Although a number of concordats are still in force under which civil authorities are permitted to name bishops, the Church, in all modern concordats, has increasingly stipulated that it must be free to appoint its own bishops, although it may admit a *droit de regard* by the civil government. Under this limited right, the civil power may submit objections to

an episcopal candidate, but Rome, nevertheless, considers itself free to disregard the objections without being considered thereby to have committed an unfriendly act.

There are good reasons for the present attitude of the Church. During the Catholic Reformation, the Holy See, in order to maintain Catholicism in Spain, France, Italy and Austria, entered into concordats with these countries whereby special ecclesiastical privileges, including that of nominating bishops, were granted to sovereigns. Unfortunately, these concessions tended in the course of time to make the Catholic Church seem a part of national governments and to identify it with the ambitions and policies of secular monarchs.

RUSSIA AND THE VATICAN

Of peculiar interest, in view of the millions of Polish, Lithuanian and other Catholic nationals now under Soviet domination, is the fact that the Emperor of Russia at one time enjoyed the privilege of naming Catholic bishops. This concession was granted under a concordat entered into between the Imperial Russian government and the Vatican in 1847. The concordat gave the Catholic Church the status of a "protected" denomination, recognized the supremacy of Roman Canon Law over Catholic marriages, provided for state-endowed religious instruction for Catholic children in state schools, the payment of

clerical salaries by the state, and protection for Catholics from proselytizing non-protected sects.

The issue of episcopal nominations still survives in Spain, where Church-State relations are based upon the Concordat of 1851 between Pope Pius IX and Queen Isabella. The concordat was suspended during the Republican regime set up in 1931, but was reinstated after the Civil War, with some modifications. The present Franco government retains the right of presenting names of new bishops, but it is an open secret that the Vatican would prefer to abrogate this privilege. Negotiations are reported to have already been concluded for a new concordat which will give greater independence to the Church.

Since the first world war, concordats have assumed a three-fold importance — political, juridical and social. Politically and juridically, concordats are of great advantage to the Church. They pave the way for exchanges of diplomatic representation, give official recognition to the Church's jurisdiction, and provide public acknowledgment of its juridical status. All this serves to enhance the prestige of the Papacy in the modern world.

Meanwhile, the social significance of concordats is seen in the freedom they give the Holy See to work for the moral and spiritual regeneration of society. Since the establishment of

a concordat means, to a greater or less degree, the incorporation of Canon Law into the legislation of a state, this tends to permeate the life of a nation with the Christian spirit, and to promote the Church's influence in national and international affairs. It is to be noted that almost all the concordats approved by Pope Pius XI call for recognition by the civil power of Catholic associations of purely religious, cultural or charitable scope

organized under the control of the hierarchy. The effect of this stipulation has been to assure individual Catholics full liberty to engage in various social and religious enterprises. Such freedom promotes both the good of the Church and the welfare of the State, a dual benefit always sought by the Vatican when it enters into a concordat, even though such agreements are primarily of a religious nature.

To Keep More People on the Land

"We now have an unbalanced population, a topheavy urban-rural relationship. It is therefore the ambition of the Catholic Rural Life Conference to keep a great percentage of those who are now in the rural areas on the land. The trend has been constantly urbanward to such an extent that we now have a population of people who are seventy-five per cent urban and only twenty-five per cent rural whereas in the latter part of the past century our national population was seventy-five per cent rural and twenty-five per cent urban. The trend of today must be checked. There is no desire on the part of the Conference completely to stop this flow. It is fully aware that, should it succeed in doing this, it would sound the death knell of our cities. But the flow must be made less rapid. A fifty-fifty urban-rural population relationship would be about right."
—Patrick T. Quinlan in *THE PRIEST*, Huntington, Ind., August, 1947.

Pros and Cons of Communism

ROBERT BARRAT

*Reprinted from TÉMOIGNAGE CHRÉTIEN**

THERE are some nails that you can never drive in hard enough.

Doubtlessly annoyed at being excluded from power, the Communists apparently are learning to offer their hand to us again. Let us, then, take the occasion which is offered to remind them once more about those things in which we are ready to agree with them and those which we reject.

With the Communists we assume the imperious necessity of putting an end to liberal capitalism, a tissue of economic contradictions generating injustice, hatred and social troubles. With them we reject primacy of money as a sole source of value, of riches and of power.

With them we affirm the eminent dignity of labor.

With them we demand that the workers, that all the workers, should have access to economic, political and social responsibilities.

With or without them we declare ourselves ready to work for the construction of a more just and more fraternal society. This in the name of our Christian religion, of the religion which reveals to us that God is a Spirit, is love and is liberty, and teaches us equally that man has been created to His image

Capitalism, in its individualist and liberal form, as a veritable system of exploitation of man by man, appears to us an attack against the dignity of human nature.

But in the name of the same demands of our religion we also energetically reject the Marxist doctrine and the Communist Party's methods of combat.

We reject the Marxist conception of a universe without God, the materialistic view of man's destiny, the exhortation for production for its own sake and the affirmation of the primacy of temporal values.

We will not accept the Marxian gospel of class warfare and the dictatorship of the proletarian state, which would mean inevitably the regimentation of consciences by means of a single party, of a single trade union and a single school system.

We reject appeals to the spirit of violence, of hate and of vengeance which are daily instilled by the Communist Party into the workmen's minds.

We reject its gross and political machiavelianism, its continual somersaults on notions as essential as religion, family and country.

We consider as dishonorable the

* 30 Rue de Gramont, Paris XI, France, June 13, 1947

procedures which are used in this propaganda, its abuse and permanent recourse to calumny and lying.

In our opposition, then, to anarchical liberalism and totalitarian Communism, we affirm:

The liberty of man, a divine creature.

The vanity of every revolution which is not a revolution for liberty at the same time as one for justice. A revolution for liberty, according to us, can only exist when it gives life and force to all those intermediate communities (families, workshops, trade unions, cultural groups of intellectual and spiritual character) which are able to defend the individual against the arbitrary power and the despotism of the modern octopus state.

We affirm that man, a spiritual creature, cannot find his happiness and his peace in the possession of any material good or in any economic, po-

litical or social realization. That it is vain to pretend to better his lot by mere transformation of the material conditions of his life, that it is not sufficient to teach man to fight against the evil which is in society, that is to say, in others. That first of all he has to learn to triumph over the evil which is in himself by the battle against his instincts and his passions.

We say that men are not on this earth in order to fight, but they are here to understand one another and to aid each other and to love one another, and we think that the only revolution which has any chance to establish a true peace and a true order would be one which would make its appeal only to the arms of light, truth, and charity.

Such is our faith, such is our revolutionary combat. If there are any Communists who are willing to fight with us on these conditions we very readily will grasp their hand.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: John LaFarge

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll

CIRCULATION MANAGER: Edward F. Clark

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.